



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 04935 5519





**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LIBRARY**

**TEXTBOOK COLLECTION
GIFT OF
THE PUBLISHERS**



**STANFORD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES**

THE GROWTH
OF
THE FRENCH NATION

•The M Co. •



LOUIS XIV.


THE GROWTH
OF THE
FRENCH NATION

BY
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS
Professor of History in Yale University

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1902

All rights reserved



COPYRIGHT, 1896,
By FLOOD & VINCENT.

Reprinted September, 1899; January, 1901;
February, 1902.

C

Norwood Press :
Berwick & Smith, Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.



PREFACE.

THE difficulty of attempting to compress the whole history of the French nation within the limits of a book of this size must be evident at a glance. It requires of necessity the exclusion of many matters of interest which belong to that history, and it is not likely that any two writers would agree in their selection of the facts to be omitted. In the present case, I have endeavored to follow, as closely as possible, the line marked out by the title of the book, and to include within it, to the best of my judgment, the important facts which show the growth of the nation from age to age. I have endeavored, also, to resist the temptation to use the space at my command for other facts, however interesting, if they do not seem to bear upon the national growth. I believe the question of insertion or exclusion has been carefully considered in every important case, but I cannot hope that my judgment will always meet with approval.

The omission which I regard with the most regret is that which concerns the economic history of France. There are periods, at least, in the growth of the nation when that side of its history deserves a fuller treatment than it has received here, and yet it could not be given without the sacrifice of other matters which seemed of more importance when a choice between them had to be made.

No attempt has been made in this book to furnish a bibliography of French history. Occasional reference

has been made in the margin to books in the English language which are of particular interest on special periods. There is no thoroughly good book as yet, either in English or in French, which covers the whole history of France. Kitchin's "History of France," in three volumes, is the best in English, but is needlessly uninteresting, and leaves much to be desired at many points. Guizot's is popular and fully illustrated, but it is uncritical and contains many versions of facts now known to be incorrect. Very good single volume histories are Duruy's and the volume on France in the "Student's Series of Histories." I wish to acknowledge my especial obligation to the "Histoire Générale" of Lavissee and Rambaud, and to Rambaud's "Histoire de la Civilisation Française."

New Haven, January, 1896.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	11
I. GAUL BEFORE THE FRANKS	14
II. THE GERMAN CONQUEST	23
III. THE DYNASTY OF THE MEROVINGIANS	32
IV. THE CAROLINGIANS AND CHARLEMAGNE	39
V. THE BREAKING UP OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE AND THE RISE OF THE FEUDAL SYSTEM	47
VI. THE FIRST CAPETIANS—THE FEUDAL KINGS AND THE FEUDAL SYSTEM	54
VII. THE FOUNDATION OF FRANCE AND OF THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY	73
VIII. STEPS TOWARD ABSOLUTISM	89
IX. THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR	108
X. FRANCE BEGINS TO BE A EUROPEAN POWER	136
XI. THE RELIGIOUS CIVIL WARS	160
XII. FRANCE AGAIN A EUROPEAN POWER	180
XIII. LOUIS XIV.	202
XIV. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	234
XV. CAUSES OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	258
XVI. TEN YEARS OF REVOLUTION	273
XVII. NAPOLEON	308
XVIII. FRANCE SINCE 1815	318
SUMMARY FOR REVIEW	341

MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

France under Francis I. (Full-page colored map) . . .	
	<i>First front lining page</i>
France in Provinces, 1715. (Full-page colored map) . .	
	<i>Second front lining page</i>
Louis XIV.	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	PAGE
A Roman Aqueduct near Nîmes, known as the Bridge of the Gard	19
Religious Music	20
A Chair said to have been Dagobert's	33
Mosaic in the Lateran, Rome	44
Silver Pennies of Charlemagne's Coinage	46
Ships of the Northmen	49
A Feudal Castle	51
A Romanesque House of the Eleventh Century at Saint- Gilles	57
Fleet of William the Conqueror Setting Sail	62
Wheelwright and Cooper	64
Masons, Stonecutters, and Sculptors	67
Farrier	68
Shop of a Money Changer	71
A Romanesque Church of the Twelfth Century. Toulouse. .	74
Town Hall of Bruges	77
Seal of Arthur of Brittany (1202)	84
Seal of the University of Paris (1292)	88
Shrine at Troyes	101
John the Good	113
Nobles under John the Good	116
Charles V	119
The Coronation of Charles V	122
The Louvre under Charles V	124
A Noble Lady	126
A Cannon of the Fifteenth Century	130
Charles VII	134

	PAGE
A Châtelaine	138
Medallions of Charles VIII. and Anne of Brittany	144
Francis I.	150
Henry II.	161
Costume of the Time of Henry II.	166
Henry III.	175
Court Costume, Time of Henry III.	176
Henry IV.	182
Sully	185
Mary de Medici	189
Louis XIII.	191
Richelieu	194
Costume of the End of the Reign of Louis XIII.	198
Cardinal Mazarin	203
Barricade of the Time of the Fronde	205
Colbert	213
Gobelin Tapestry	215
Louis de Bourbon, the Great Condé	218
Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne	222
La Fontaine	230
Racine	231
Molière	232
Facsimile of a Bill of Law's Royal Bank	238
Louis XV.	240
Dupleix	243
Costume of the Court of Louis XV.	245
Decorated Sedan-Chair of the Eighteenth Century	248
Turgot	251
Coiffure à la <i>Belle-Poule</i>	253
Beauvais Tapestry	262
A Country Pharmacy	264
Voltaire	268
Jean Jacques Rousseau	269
Montesquieu	271
Louis XVI.	276
Marie Antoinette	278
Facsimile of an <i>Assignat</i>	283
Mirabeau	285
Robespierre	291
Louis XVII., the Dauphin	293

	PAGE
Costume of the Time of the Revolution, in Imitation of the Greek	296
Lazare Carnot	298
Arch of Triumph, Paris	302
Medallion of the Three Consuls	306
Napoleon	308
Coin of the Year XII., 1803-4	311
Wellington	313
Louis XVIII	315
Medal to Commemorate the Charter of 1814	319
An Officer of Guides of the Imperial Guard	322
Lazare Hippolyte Carnot	324
A Cuirassier Officer, French Cavalry, during the Second Empire	325
Napoleon III.	327
Thiers	330
Marshal MacMahon	331
M. Grévy	333
Sadi Carnot	334
Jules Ferry	336
Casimir Périer	338
M. Félix Faure	339
France in Departments. (Two-page colored map)	

End lining pages

THE GROWTH OF THE FRENCH NATION.

INTRODUCTION.

IN more than one age of the past, the French nation has been the leading nation of the world, whether one means by that the most powerful of the nations or the leader of the world in the arts of civilization. If it seems to us improbable that France should ever again occupy the commanding position which has sometimes been hers in the past, the fact does not diminish the interest with which we must regard her history. To the American people especially, occupying the continent which she so nearly made her own, and influenced, as we have been, in peculiar ways by her history, the story of the French people can hardly be of inferior interest to that of our own mother country.

French history
of peculiar
interest to us.

The story of the growth of the French nation is a very peculiar one. The country was occupied, when its real history opens, by a great race—the Celtic—which forms through all later changes the main stock of its population, but whose language and institutions have disappeared almost completely from the final product. The country was then conquered by another great race—the Roman—which made almost no contribution to the blood of the French nation, but which did give it its language, and the larger share of its institutions and its laws. Finally a third race occupied the country by conquest—the German—which added a new element, but a minor one, to the population, and which profoundly influenced, for

A succession of
races.

The young republic of France has rendered i

easy for the nation to secure a commanding position in Europe, giving it, as it does, a coast-line upon the English Channel, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean, and an interior boundary line which brings it into contact with the nations of both southern and northern Europe. Its great river systems, however, seem to divide the country into two halves, a southern and a northern, and this fact has not been without influence upon the history of the nation.

Geographical
influence.

CHAPTER I.

GAUL BEFORE THE FRANKS.

Celtic Gaul.

AT the time of the Roman conquest, the country which was to form the later France was occupied by a great number of tribes of the Celtic race, and their blood probably forms by far the largest element in that of the present French people. But the Celts were not the first inhabitants of Gaul. The remains of primitive man which have been found in France, of the Stone Age, and of the cave-dwellers, show us that the country was inhabited long before the advent of the men of the Aryan race. But these earlier inhabitants could not hold their ground before the stronger and more civilized Celts, and they disappeared, or were perhaps absorbed, in part at least, by their conquerors. The Celts themselves were hardly more than savages when the Roman conquest began. They were divided into many independent tribes, owning no common allegiance, though some of the tribes had established a kind of supremacy over others, and some had joined together in confederations. Within the tribes there was no firmly established government. Some few had kings, but in most the control of affairs was in the hands of a primitive aristocracy who ruled in a patriarchal way and were supported by large bodies of devoted clients. The tribes were often weakened by the rivalries of these chiefs with one another, or by the attempt of some one of them to make himself a supreme ruler over the tribe. It was a condition very favorable to the Roman conquest.

Tribal government,

favoring the Roman conquest.

It is with the conquest by the Romans that Gaul really enters upon the stage of the world's history. We shall always associate that conquest in a peculiar way with the name of Julius Cæsar, but in reality Cæsar's Gallic war was only a further stage in a process which had long been going on, and his conquest was, in some degree at least, forced upon him by the circumstances which confronted him in Gaul.

The beginning
of the Roman
conquest.

The slowly expanding Roman state in Italy had begun to creep over the lands occupied by the Celts in northern Italy as early as 225 B. C. This conquest was interrupted for a time by the great invasion of Hannibal, but was resumed again after his fall, and a few years later Rome had reached the frontier of the Alps. For a generation or more this remained the limit of the Roman advance, but in 154 B. C. the Greek colony of Massilia, now Marseilles, asked the Romans for help against some of the Gallic tribes. Massilia had been the ally of Rome against Carthage and her assistance had been of great value in the conquest of Spain. It was not the custom of Rome to desert her allies, especially not if they offered a starting point for a new conquest. A Roman army proceeded at once to Massilia, subdued her enemies, and established a Roman protectorate along the seacoast. But Rome could not stop with that. The beginning of the Roman conquest is in a small way typical of the larger conquest of all Gaul. The neighboring tribes in their savage restlessness, or in their quarrels with one another, were constantly threatening the peace and security of the land already Roman, and further conquest seemed the only remedy. So Rome was led on from one advance to another, as England has been in many quarters of the globe, and still more recently Russia, though very possibly in the ancient case, and in the

Conquest of
Cisalpine Gaul.

The appeal of
Massilia.

A Roman pro-
tectorate.

The "Province."

modern ones too for that matter, the conquerors were not reluctant to be led in that direction. About 120 B. C. they organized west of the Alps "the Province"—*Provincia*, *Provence*—its boundary lines soon extending north to Geneva and Lyons, following down the Cévennes, striking west from near their southern end to take in Toulouse, and from that point dropping south to the Pyrenees. This was not a large land as compared with the whole of Gaul, but it was a foothold and it was certain to involve, sooner or later, all that did follow.

See Fowler's "Julius Cæsar" in the "Heroes of the Nations" series.

This was the province of which Cæsar took possession early in 58 B. C., together with Cisalpine Gaul, as the territory assigned to him after his consulship. It was known at the time that serious danger was threatening the province, but no one could have known how serious the danger really was. The Germans had already discovered the weakness of the Celts and had crossed the Rhine to begin, so long before they would be able to take it up again, that conquest of Gaul which was one day to transform the country both politically and institutionally. The contest of the *Ædui* with the *Arverni* and *Sequani* for supremacy in eastern Gaul had enabled *Ariovistus* with his Germans to get a firm footing just north and west of the Romans, in a position which seriously threatened their hold upon the land. But before Cæsar could deal with this danger he had to beat back the attack of the *Helvetians*, who were trying to emigrate with all their belongings into better lands than their own mountain valleys. This Cæsar accomplished in a few weeks in a campaign which reveals the marvelous qualities of his generalship. Then he was free to turn against the more serious, because more permanent, danger presented by the Germans in Gaul. In another short campaign he destroyed their army and forced the king to take refuge

A German invasion.

The migration of the *Helvetians*.

on the other side of the Rhine, checking the German invasion of Gaul for more than four hundred years.

This campaign changed the situation in more ways than one. It carried the Romans to the Rhine, far beyond their original boundary, almost as far north as Strasburg. What should be done with this territory virtually conquered? At what time Cæsar formed the plan of taking all Gaul for the Romans we cannot say, but this campaign seems at least to have convinced many among the Gauls that this danger was imminent. The union which the tribes of the Belgæ formed in the following winter against the Romans gave Cæsar an opportunity to subdue northern Gaul, and this was speedily followed by the apparent subjection of the whole country. But it had been too sudden a conquest to be a real one, and in the following years Cæsar had to put down two great rebellions, a task almost as difficult as the original conquest. At last, after eight years the work was done, and Gaul became a Roman land, never again to make any serious attempt to recover its independence.

The Romans on the Rhine.

If the Celtic race forms the leading element in the later population of France, it had only the slightest influence on the institutional or philological history of the nation so far as can now be traced. The language and institutions of the Celts disappeared in the mixture of the subsequent races as completely as if they had never had any existence on the soil. This was due primarily to the Roman conquest and to the character of their occupation. It may be true, as has often been said, that the Romans made no especial attempt to dispossess the subject race, or to supplant their civilization with the more perfect civilization of their own. But the result was the same as if they had. Celtic religion, Celtic dress, Celtic arms, names, manners, and laws all went down

The results of the Roman conquest.

Thorough
Romanization.


before the superior advantages of that which the new government supplied. Effort was not necessary on the part of the Romans. The silent force of the greater convenience of the new way was the only force. In a century Gaul was as thoroughly Roman as Italy itself; it was indeed said that it was more so. At any rate, the schools of Gaul were famous throughout the empire, and boys attended them from the other provinces to learn the art of composition and expression, that is, to learn the language of the conquerors from the conquered! History has not many cases of this sort to record.

Mildness of the
Roman rule.

Until toward the last days of the empire the Roman rule was liberal. It interfered but little in local affairs, and it made no direct attack upon any features of the native civilization except such as seemed to be dangerous to the state or inhuman, like the druidical organization and human sacrifices. From the very beginning the Romans introduced peace and order in the place of constant civil strife, and a common government in the place of dozens of independent tribes. The system of Roman roads, which mainly centered in Lyons, made intercommunication easy and opened the way for a rapidly developing commerce. The more primitive cultivation of the Gallic tribes gave place to the organized Roman agriculture with its great estates and its slave labor. Towns took on the form of the Roman municipal organization. The Roman public school system was introduced. Roman law gradually supplanted the cruder tribal customs and druidism also disappeared. And all this transformation was accomplished not as the result of a determined effort on the part of the Romans, but because the Gauls found it in every case for their own interests to make the change. The Romans treated them as allies and friends rather than as

subjects. They were employed in the army; the full Roman citizenship was gradually opened to them; their nobility was recognized and soon admitted to the senate, and they speedily began to call themselves Romans and to adopt Latin family names and the

The Gauls
were treated
as Romans.



A ROMAN AQUEDUCT NEAR NIMES, KNOWN AS THE BRIDGE OF THE GARD.

Roman dress and language. In the end Gaul became thoroughly Romanized, able to pass on to its later conquerors not the primitive Celtic, but the higher classic civilization.

Under the Romans, Christianity was introduced into Gaul, possibly as early as the first century. At first its progress was very slow, and for a long time it seems to have been confined to the cities of the south and east, where it suffered severely in the persecution under the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Toward the middle of the third century missionaries were sent into Gaul from

Christianity
introduced.

Paganism
lasted only in
the country.

Rome, and as a result of their work Christianity spread rapidly over the whole country. In the country districts of Gaul, as in all the provinces, paganism lived on for many generations, but the cities and the intelligent classes became Christian. It was very likely the strength of Christianity in Gaul, with which he was well acquainted, which suggested to Constantine, when he began his struggle for supreme power in the empire, at the beginning of the fourth century, to declare himself the protector of the Christians. With his success came



RELIGIOUS MUSIC.

From a window of the Cathedral of Bourges.

the official recognition of Christianity, and a little later paganism was made unlawful. In Gaul, as throughout the whole empire, the church organized itself upon the model of the state. Each of the cities had its bishop, and the capital city of each of the provinces into which the country was divided—there

were seventeen in Gaul—had its archbishop. So firmly was the Roman organization fixed in that of the church that Paris, which was not an important Roman city, had no archbishop until the seventeenth century, and the Roman boundary lines were perpetuated in those of the ecclesiastical provinces until the Revolution.

Roman class
distinctions.

The class distinctions which the Romans established, or continued, in Gaul had, also, a profound influence upon later times and formed the foundation of social distinctions which lasted into modern history. In the free

population, there were three well-marked grades. At the top were the great landed proprietors, or nobles, most of whom were of senatorial rank, that is, recognized nobles of the empire; below these were the smaller landowners, who, except those who owned the very smallest properties, made up the curial class, or the local small nobles; and, finally, the town population, or the mercantile and artisan class. Of the unfree population, there were two distinct classes. Lowest of all was the slave, who was absolutely at his master's disposal; above the slave was the class called *coloni*, bound to the soil and to labor, but like his successor, the serf, secured in the possession of a little homestead and not subject to the master's arbitrary will. These class distinctions the Germans, when they took possession of Gaul, found so nearly like their own and so easily understood that they continued them with but little modification, and they may be said to be characteristic of the whole Middle Ages and to have remained, in part at least, until swept away by the Revolution.

One of the sources of medieval serfage.

To this distinction of persons corresponded also the landowning and agricultural arrangements of the province, another source of permanent institutions. The country was almost covered with the great estates of the nobles, each organized and cultivated as a unit—the *villa*—under the control of a steward, and divided into cultivated fields, meadows, and woods. The part of the estate which the owner kept in his own hand was cultivated by slaves, a part was divided out among the *coloni*, each of whom cultivated his own little holding, paying the owner from his produce. The small proprietors, without the resources of money or slaves which the great nobles had, suffered severely from the unfavorable economic and political conditions of the last days of the

The Roman agricultural system.

empire, and many of them were forced to give up their land to some powerful neighbor to secure his protection. Their land they received back as tenants of the lord, but the tendency was to increase the size of the great estates and the power of the nobles. This was not exactly the same as the later feudal system, but it was the foundation on which it was built.

One source of the feudal system.

Gaul remained under Roman rule for something more than four centuries, but they were the centuries of Rome's decay. Already, as early as Cæsar's conquest, the seeds of disease were germinating in the state, but the results were not evident for nearly two hundred years. The empire was, however, continually growing weaker, weaker in men, in resources, and in power to keep order. The government passed gradually from good to bad; the burdens of the state grew heavier as the power to bear them lessened; economic measures adopted to check the evils of the time proved ineffective or positively harmful; civil wars became frequent, and the strength of the state was exhausted in every direction, both by positive evils and by efforts at reform. Gaul shared to the full in the sufferings of the empire. She had, perhaps, more than her share of civil war, whether from usurping emperors or from the laboring class who, unable to endure their burdens any longer, broke out into a great peasant insurrection and defied the state. Gaul was not merely too weak to defend herself against a strong attack, but she had no motive for doing so. She had no real patriotism, no fear of a worse government, and but little left to defend. The German had only to cross the Rhine and the country was his.

The decline of Rome.

Called "the Bagaudæ."

CHAPTER II.

THE GERMAN CONQUEST.

It was on the last day of December, 406, that the first fury of the storm broke upon Gaul. A great combination of German tribes—Vandals, Burgundians, Alans, and Suevi—crossed the Rhine on the ice and, overcoming the resistance of the Franks, who were settled along the river, found no other serious opposition. The whole country was open before them. The great cities that dared to close their gates were stormed and burned. The churches and other sacred places afforded no protection. Rome had no army to send against them, and they marched through the length of the land as they pleased. At last, the most of them passed through the Pyrenees to seek homes in Spain, but the Burgundians settled around the headwaters of the Rhone, in lands which they afterward enlarged and to which they gave their name, the Duchy and the Free County (Franche-Comté) of Burgundy. Not long afterward the emperor recognized the Burgundian state as a dependent kingdom.

The first invasion.

A. D. 413.

A little later another great German tribe—the Visigoths—who had broken through the Danube frontier nearly fifty years before and since then had invaded Italy and sacked Rome, were allowed to settle in southern Gaul as the allies of the empire.

The Visigoths in Gaul, A. D. 419.

The permission which Rome granted to these tribes was one which she could not withhold, and the kingdoms which they formed were really independent, though

The Germans
not unwelcome.

they acknowledged the supremacy of the emperor. As a rule, the condition of the Roman provincials was not made worse by these conquests, in some respects it became better, and Rome's old subjects had no occasion to regret her rule. Indeed, some of the enlargements of the Burgundian territory were made at the request of the Roman inhabitants who wished to escape their burdens.

The Franks.

Up to this time, the Franks, the Teutonic race who were finally to rule the whole country and give it their name, had made no attempt to extend their lands beyond the immediate valley of the Rhine. They had appeared on its left bank about the end of the third century, occupying land in its lower course, sometimes in conflict with the Romans, sometimes, and apparently for longer intervals, in alliance with them or as their subjects. In the evil days of the fourth century, the Franks were continually enlarging their lands, but always in the Rhine Valley.

The attack of
the Huns, 451.

It was in the middle of the fifth century that the worst danger of these times befell Gaul, in the invasion of Attila and the Huns. It was the worst danger because if the invasion had been successful the country would have been subjected to a far lower and more hopeless barbarism than that of the Germans. In the great "battle of the nations" in which this question was settled, Franks, like Goths and Saxons, fought in both armies. Those Germans, however, who had settled within the limits of Roman Gaul came bravely to the defense of their new fatherland, and helped to preserve it to the influences of Rome and of Christianity. In the battle of Châlons, in the summer of 451, Attila was defeated and the Huns were never again able to invade Gaul.

The battle of
Châlons.

The real conquest of Gaul by the Franks, and with it the history of the French nation in the immediate sense, begins with the reign of Clovis (Chlodowech) in 481. At that date the Franks were divided into two chief tribes, the Ripuarian, who occupied the middle Rhine, and the Salian, who held the lower Rhine near the sea. But each of these tribes instead of being united in a single government was parted into a number of subdivisions each under a king of its own. If the Franks were to be made into a great nation, rulers of a wide territory, like the Visigoths, not merely must the territory be conquered but the nation also must be consolidated under the rule of a single king. This was the double labor which Clovis had to undertake in beginning the history of France as distinguished from that of Gaul.

Clovis, 481-511.

When he began, he was king of one only of the subdivisions of the Salian Franks, dwelling in the vicinity of Tournay, and he seems to have had in his army only a few hundred men. His first step was to attack the land held by Syagrius, the son of a Roman officer of northern Gaul. This territory stretched from the western boundary of the Franks off across the upper waters of the Seine toward the Loire, and was apparently a little Roman island not yet occupied by the Germans. Clovis obtained the help of one of the other Salian sub-kings, and in a single battle overthrew Syagrius. A few minor combats carried his dominions to the Loire, the first noteworthy advance of the Frankish power.

Clovis's first success.

486.

It was in this campaign that the familiar incident of the vase occurred which illustrates so well the great freedom of the German soldier and the peculiar character of the authority of the German king. At the division of the booty at Soissons, Clovis requested that

The vase of Soissons.

a beautiful vase might be given to him, intending to restore it to the church from which it had been taken. But a common soldier dashed it to pieces with his weapon, saying that the king should have only what fell to him by lot. Clovis had to let the matter pass, but he did not forget, and the next year at a review of the troops, pretending that the man's arms were in disorder, he struck him dead before the line, reminding him of the vase at Soissons.

Arian and
Catholic Chris-
tianity.

In the interval between this and the next important conquest, occurred an event of great influence upon the future. The Burgundians and the Visigoths, who occupied so much of Gaul, were Christians, but they were Arians, a Unitarian sect, called heretics by the Catholics, and in their turn not recognizing the authority of the pope. The wide extent of territory which these Arians held—the Visigoths now ruled Spain, and the Ostrogoths, under their great king, Theodoric, were just taking possession of Italy—threatened the unity of the western church with a most serious danger, and bade fair to cut off one of the most direct of the channels through which the ancient civilization could affect the new German states. One branch, however, of the Burgundian royal family was Catholic, though it had been driven out of power and its leading members killed by the Arian branch. A marriage was now arranged, perhaps by some of the Catholic bishops of his kingdom, between Clovis and Clotilda, a princess of the Catholic branch. Her efforts to convert Clovis and the Franks, who were still pagans, were for a time unsuccessful. Their first son, whom Clovis had allowed her to baptize, died within a week, and the king was convinced that the pagan gods were the stronger.

Clovis marries a
Christian wife.

It was in battle, characteristically enough, that he

decided to become a Christian. This was in a war with the German Alemanni, who had taken possession of a large territory on both sides of the Rhine in its upper course. Clovis subdued them in a single battle, but it was a desperate one. In the midst of it Clovis, in despair of help from his own gods, cried out that if Christ would help him he would become a Christian. The victory was followed by his baptism and the gradual conversion of the nation to the Catholic faith. It was followed also by a large increase of Clovis's kingdom and of his power.

Clovis adopts
Catholic Christianity.

Clovis had now multiplied many times the size of his original kingdom, but his largest conquests were still to come. He next attacked the Burgundians, taking advantage of the two parties in the state, and reduced them to the position of a tributary kingdom. Then he turned against the great Visigothic state which stretched from the Loire to Gibraltar, and seemed more than a match for the Franks. But the power of the Visigoths had declined since their settlement, and they were still further weakened by internal dissensions. The Frankish accounts, written a little later, represent the war as a kind of religious crusade on the part of Clovis against the wicked Arians, and possibly the Catholic subjects of the Visigoths prayed for his success. In the decisive battle of Vouillé, the Visigothic king was killed and their army completely defeated. Some fragments of their territory on the Mediterranean coast were saved from the Franks by the intervention of the Ostrogoths of Italy, but all the rest down to the Pyrenees was added to the kingdom of Clovis.

The Franks
conquer all
Gaul.

507.

We are told that the last part of the life of Clovis was occupied in consolidating the Franks themselves into a single kingdom. Their little states were brought to-

Union of the
Franks under
one king.

gether, and their petty kings were set aside by a method which was thoroughly in accord with the character of Clovis, a barbarian and a conqueror without a conscience. By a series of treacherous intrigues, assassinations, and even murders with his own hand, the other kings, and his own relatives in some cases, were got out of the way, and the Franks accepted him as their sole king.

The beginning
of France.

In this way, Clovis had done the work of his life and begun the history of France. It was the beginning of the history of France geographically, because he had united once more under a single rule, never again to be so completely separated, the land of France, which the various German tribes had seemed about to divide into independent states. It was the beginning of the history of the French nation also, because the population of the land was not now Celtic, or Roman and Celtic alone, but the other great element of the future had been added to it—the Teutonic or Frankish.

The Frankish
conquest not an
emigration.

Two things should be especially noticed in this Frankish conquest because they were of decisive influence on the future of France. One of these is the fact that the Franks, unlike the other German tribes, did not abandon their original home. They did not cut themselves off from the old German land and emigrate to a distance where they were entirely surrounded by the more numerous and more highly civilized Romans. Their old homes in the Rhine Valley, which were now pure German lands, they still held and simply spread out over other territory as they conquered it. This kept open the sources of a constant reënforcement to the German elements in the new community, and was a great protection against the danger which threatened the still

unformed and plastic institutions of the Franks, of entirely disappearing before the more highly developed institutions of the Romans. It was partly this which made it certain that one great source of the strength of the new state was to be in the Teutonic forces at work in its public life. The solid framework of its government was and remained Teutonic, but Teutonic everywhere modified, and sometimes profoundly modified, but not destroyed, by Roman institutions.

The new civilization was to be both Roman and German,

The other point to be especially noticed here, is the fact that the Franks were converted to the Catholic and not to the Arian form of Christianity. They were thus brought, at the beginning of their history, into alliance with the church which was to be, besides themselves, the other great force of the future. Indeed, this conversion of the Franks largely determined the future of the church and kept in power the strongest influence which was at work for European unity and for a higher civilization.

together with Catholic Christianity.

In the public life of the Franks, four facts are of especial moment for the future.

German institutions.

First, the kingship. The primitive German king obtained his office from the people by election. In times of peace his power was very limited ; only in war did he exercise great authority. But after the conquest this office underwent great change. Partly, perhaps, as a result of the new conditions in which the nation found itself in making and holding a great conquest, and partly under the influence of the absolute monarchy which they found established in Gaul by the Romans, the king grew much more powerful, the popular control over him was lost, and he became almost or quite absolute.

The kingship.

A second is the institution called by the Romans the

The *comitatus*. *comitatus*. This was a band of warriors attached to the king, or to the chief of the tribe, supported and armed by him, and bound to him by a peculiar and especially strong bond of fidelity and devotion. It was a kind of king's guard, and, like the "old guard" of Napoleon, was a main reliance of the tribe for desperate fighting and leadership in battle. It was an especially honorable service, and place in the king's *comitatus* was sought for by youths even of noble birth. This institution did not last long in the new circumstances created by the conquest of a great kingdom, but the spirit of fidelity, of intense loyalty to the lord, which was characteristic of it, passed over into the institution which took its place, and became, from this source, one of the features of the later feudal system.

Not the source of feudalism, but of some of its characteristics.

The public assemblies.

The third is the legislative and judicial organization of the primitive Frankish state. This was simple and democratic, consisting of a series of public assemblies in which each of the free citizens, able to bear arms, had an equal voice. The number of these assemblies in the Frankish state is a matter of some dispute, but two certainly existed, a tribal, or national, and a local. These did not differ from one another in the manner of procedure but in the importance of the cases. Legislative and judicial acts were hardly distinguished in their nature, but the judicial process was somewhat more complicated. In both cases the decision reached was that of the assembly, or, we may say, was the verdict of public opinion. The local assembly among the Franks, whose existence is not disputed, was that of the hundred, or subdivision of the county—perhaps the territory originally occupied by a hundred warriors and their families. It was a local self-governing unit under the tribe—like the New England township under the state,

though with larger powers, since the hundred meeting, or *mallus*, was a local law court as well as legislature. As the king became more powerful in the new Frankish kingdom of all Gaul, the national assembly lost its influence and became merely formal or ceased altogether. The local assemblies, however, continued to act for all ordinary litigation, and formed the foundation of the French judicial system to the end of the feudal period.

Finally, the division of the population into classes in the Frankish state approached very closely to the Roman arrangements. Nobles, freemen, and slaves were practically the same in the two societies, and if the Franks had no class exactly like the Roman *coloni*, their condition was more or less closely approached by the freedman or by the slave who had been granted special privileges by his master or by the freeman who had been obliged for any reason to become a dependent upon another, perhaps for land to cultivate. The gradations were so nearly alike that we find the Franks making no change in the classification which they found existing when they entered into possession of the Roman province.

The classes of
the population.

CHAPTER III.

THE DYNASTY OF THE MEROVINGIANS.

The kings of
"the first family."

THE descendants of Clovis form a dynasty which French historians have agreed to number first in their national history. The details of this age have little significance for the future, but certain general features must be regarded. The period, which extends to 751, falls into two divisions ; the first going to 638 is the age of Merovingian strength, the later is the age of decline and fall.

Partitions of
the Frankish
territories.


Clovis, following a primitive German custom, parted his kingdom among his four sons—an example which was followed through all the history which may be called distinctively Frankish down to the tenth century. But there were throughout frequent periods of union under a single ruler, the various partitions differed somewhat from one another geographically, so that no permanent interior boundary lines were established, and national unity of a certain sort was always recognized, though the Franks did not yet have the modern feeling of nationality which is so strong with us ; that was of later growth.

Conquests after
Clovis.

The immediate successors of Clovis continued to enlarge by conquest the territory of the Franks. Central Germany, east and southeast of the Frankish land proper, which was later called Franconia, was annexed ; Burgundy was reduced from a vassal to a subject state and received a Frankish king ; Septimania and parts of Provence were taken from the Goths ; and Italy and

Spain were several times invaded though without permanent occupation. The rule of the Franks was steadily spreading over the West. Their kings boasted of their alliance with the great imperial church, and corresponded on equal terms with the emperors of Rome who still ruled at Constantinople. Dagobert, the last of the strong Merovingian kings, held in appearance an

Dagobert,
628-638.



A CHAIR SAID TO HAVE BEEN DAGOBERT'S.
The seat was made with thick cushions.

almost imperial position ; ruler of all Gaul and of the greater part of Germany, very influential in the affairs of Spain, victorious over Slavs and Bulgarians, and at home a great king, encouraging commerce and putting into better shape the law codes of his subjects.

But the causes of rapid decay were already at work in the Frankish state. The Franks were passionate and

Decline of the
Franks.

violent by nature, among the most brutal of the conquerors of Rome, falling easily into physical crimes of all sorts, and hardly kept even in a rude and savage order by their government. The violent passions of the race were fully reflected in its royal family. The familiar story of the long civil war between the two rival queens, Fredegonda of Neustria and Brunhilda of Austrasia, full of secret and public treasons and murders, in which at last Fredegonda assassinates her own husband, and Brunhilda, after deliberately ruining the character of her grandchildren in order to be able to keep the power in her own hands, is tied to the heels of a wild horse and torn to pieces—this history is typical of the character of the Merovingian race. Their strength, mental and physical, was rapidly exhausted by their excesses, and their power fell by degrees into other hands. After Dagobert we enter upon the times of the *rois fainéants*, or “do-nothing” kings, and of the great “mayors of the palace.”

Increasing
power of the
nobles.

The power which fell from the hands of the kings found other hands ready to receive it. If the conquest had increased greatly the power of the kings, it had also developed in equal proportion the strength and ambition of the nobles. The estates which fell into their hands after the conquest were rapidly enlarged by the gifts of the kings to reward and secure their services, and by the attachment to them in dependent relations of the smaller landholders who needed some powerful protector near at hand in such turbulent times. The administrative system of the Frankish state tended also to increase the power of the aristocracy. The chief officer of the government was the count, a kind of governor over the counties into which the country was divided. He was the head of the county's military levy, presided over its

The count.

local assemblies, looked after the revenues due the state, and represented the central government in that locality in all its departments. It is easy to see that if one of the greater magnates of the county obtained the office he could use it with great advantage to increase his own power.

In these various ways a powerful aristocracy grew up which began to resent the king's absolute control and to strive for greater independence even under the strong Merovingian sovereigns. In 614 it forced from Lothaire II., at the time sole king of the Franks, an edict which is called the "perpetual constitution" and which has sometimes been compared to the Magna Charta, though, naturally from the earlier date, it is far inferior to the English document in the elements of public liberty which it secures. It provides, indeed, against the arbitrary action of the king : condemnations without trial ; edicts contrary to the law ; and the seizing of the goods of those who die intestate or the compulsory marriage of their children or widows. But these provisions were intended in the main for the protection of the nobles, and still more so the clause which provides that the count must be chosen by the king from the county which he is to govern. This clause was of vital importance to the aristocracy, and it deprived the king of one of his most important resources against them, the ability to select as his representative a man thoroughly devoted to himself, not affected by the interests and temptations which would influence a proprietor belonging to the locality. The aristocracy which could come so near a triumph over the stronger Merovingian sovereigns was not likely to leave them more than a shadow of power when their strength had departed.

The Frankish
"Magna
Charta."

The power of
the nobility.

But the triumph of this aristocracy carried with it

It threatens the dissolution of the Frankish state.

Rise of the Carolingian family.

a great danger for the future of the Merovingian state and for the future of France as well. The ruin of the king and the victory of the nobles would mean the breaking up of the great conquest of Clovis into smaller and more helpless fragments than those from which he had at first constructed it. If the victory of the nobles was to be, at this time, a permanent victory, the history of the Franks as a nation would be at an end. The state was saved from this danger by the rise of a single family of nobles into a position of overwhelming strength. It was rather the union into a single family of two of the greatest families of the Rhine Valley, the families of Pippin the Elder, of Landen, and of Arnulf, bishop of Metz. With their grandson, Pippin the Younger, of Heristal, this great family, called later the Carolingian, began its permanent control of the Frankish government, which was finally to become so complete that they could depose the Merovingian family and assume the crown themselves. The failure of the Merovingians and the near danger of the entire dissolution of the state made way for the great centralizing power of the future, for all Europe indeed, as well as—for France—the Carolingians and Charlemagne.

Separation between the German and the Romanized Franks.

The east German.

In the mean time the Frankish people had begun to separate into two slightly varying halves, the East Franks and the West Franks—the beginning of a difference which was to form in the end a permanent national separation. The valley of the Rhine was a pure German land. For some reason the Roman inhabitants had disappeared from it, leaving the way clear for the Franks, or the small Roman remainder left behind had been wholly absorbed. Farther west the Franks settled in the midst of a more numerous Roman population and underwent there the common fate of the German settlers

in Roman lands ; they became slowly Romanized and lost their German traits, language, and even to some extent their political habits, for in the western kingdom the kings were stronger and the nobles less influential than in the eastern kingdom. In the frequent divisions of the Frankish Kingdom, these two lands were apt to have each its own king, and they become known by separate names : the eastern, Austrasia ; and the western, Neustria.

The west
Romanized.

As the authority of the Merovingians declined, these two kingdoms, one the Rhine Valley, the other north central France, together with Burgundy, were about all that remained of the great dominion of the immediate successors of Clovis. The outlying lands, only slightly occupied with Frankish settlers, took advantage of the growing weakness of their rulers to try to recover their independence. Brittany, Aquitaine, and Bavaria restored their native dynasties and threw off their dependence upon the Franks. Here was another task for the new family. The double mission of the first three great princes which it produced was to restore the strength of the central government and to recover the conquests which had been almost lost.

The new family obtained its strong hold upon the state not merely by means of its vast private resources, but also by getting exclusive possession of the most important public office of the kingdom ; they became hereditary mayors of the palace. Under the absolute Merovingian kings the government of the kingdom centered in the king's court or "palace." The mayor of the palace, originally steward of the king's household, gradually became the controlling officer of the court, and as the kings became mere shadows of kings they easily and naturally took into their hands the powers which the

The mission of
the Carolin-
gians.

The mayors of
the palace.

The battle of
Testry in 687.
The Neustrians
defeated.

kings no longer exercised. The Carolingians did not obtain permanent possession of this office without desperate struggles with rivals, but finally Pippin the Younger acquired a firm hold of power, in Austrasia first, which he ruled as duke, and then, after the battle of Testry, in the other two kingdoms. His successors, though they retained the office of mayor of the palace, marked their assumption of a position which was more than a mere office by the use of the title Duke of the Franks, and they were sometimes even addressed by the title of sub-king.

Results of the
rise of the Car-
olingians.

This unity of all the Frankish kingdoms under the single government of the Carolingian dukes was more than a reunion of the Frankish nation. It was a reunion complete enough to prevent the growing difference between the eastern and western Franks from separating them permanently into two nations for two hundred years. But at the same time it was a strong reënforcement of the pure German influences in the state. These now recovered a control of the whole nation which they were long to retain. Indeed, the rise of the Carolingians marks the beginning of a new era of German conquest, the founding of a great empire which was to rival that of Rome, and finally to bear its name, but really a German empire, so strongly organized according to German methods of organization that it gave to the law and institutions of the Franks a permanent influence far beyond the bounds of the state to which their name was finally to be restricted.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CAROLINGIANS AND CHARLEMAGNE.

PIPPIN OF HERISTAL, after his triumph at Testry, which gave him control of all the Franks, was hardly able to do more than to begin the work of reconstruction, and he left that task still uncompleted to his son and successor, Charles Martel. On the death of Pippin, the union which he had established threatened to fall to pieces, and the first three or four years of the rule of Charles were occupied with a struggle for the possession of power like that of his father before Testry. He then took up with immense vigor the business of his life. He crushed the nobles who were splitting the country up into local principalities for themselves; Alemanni, Bavarians, and Aquitanians were taught that the Franks had not forgotten their claims to sovereignty; and the Frisians and Saxons of the North, who were now beginning to be restless with the old German desire to invade the South, were beaten off. It was a life of ceaseless marching and fighting, but it was successful. The Frankish dominion of the best Merovingian days was almost recovered.

Charles Martel,
714-741.

Reconstruction
of the Frankish
state.

These were services to the future great enough to entitle him to a sure place in the world's history, but a single victory which he had the skill to win seemed to after times to outweigh all his other work and gave him his peculiar name and glory. The Arabs, under the first influence of the enthusiasm which Mohammed had kindled in their wild tribes, had spread their empire to

Invasion of the
Arabs.

732.

the Atlantic, had conquered Spain, and in the years immediately following the accession of Charles Martel were occupying southern France. Finally they gathered a great army and advanced almost to the Loire on a great plundering raid if not for the conquest of the whole land. There it was, in the great battle which English writers call the battle of Tours and the French that of Poitiers, that Charles inflicted so severe a defeat upon them that they never renewed the attempt. It was not without reason that this exploit eclipsed in the popular remembrance all his other services, for had not Charles blocked the way all Europe would apparently have been open to the Arabs if they had attempted its conquest.

Pippin le Bref,
741-768.

Charles's son and successor, Pippin the Short, continued and completed the work of restoring the old Frankish dominion, but two series of events during his time show clearly how far the process of making something more than a nation, of making a great Frankish empire, had already gone.

Condition of
the Frankish
Church.

One of these is the reform and reorganization of the Frankish Church. The Franks had been converted under Clovis, and in many ways it was a real conversion, though it was a very summary one. But it was not complete enough—one can understand that without difficulty—to prevent the carrying of a great deal of Teutonic barbarism over into the church. The bishop became a noble. In the conflict between the aristocracy and the kings, the bishops took part with their class, and what the noble was trying to do in establishing the independence of his country, the bishop strove to do with his city and bishopric. The character of the bishops, nobles more than priests, soldiers and hunters rather than scholars, was not improved by the first

Carolingians. They needed to use the lands of the church for public purposes, and they sometimes took possession of them by installing in the bishopric a warrior who had never been a priest. But other influences were at work. The Saxons of England were deeply interested in converting their relatives in north Germany. The Carolingians encouraged and protected these missionaries as a means of subduing the fierce Saxons. But the influence of the truer Christianity which the missionaries represented reacted upon the Frankish Church. Especially strong was the influence of St. Boniface, the ablest of their number. And also as the growth of this empire of the Carolingians brought them more and more into contact with the great papal church, they seem to have realized that they had more to gain from their national church as a handmaid of the government, working for order and a better public organization, than could be had from the mere use of its endowments. And so the Frankish Church was reformed and more closely organized under the direction of Boniface, and a similar organization, all centering in the pope as its rightful head, was given to the German conquests which the Franks had made. The church of the growing empire which the Franks were creating was given its place in the Catholic organization which was already imperial.

Anglo-Saxon missionaries.

The influence of the papal church.

The other significant series of events was that by which the Carolingians were brought into Italy and Rome. The Lombards had set up a German kingdom in Italy, in the last part of the sixth century, but had not been able to occupy the whole land, and Rome was one of the places which had escaped them. It was cut off, however, by Lombard land from the other bits of Italy which the Greek Empire retained, and its government, in the absence of any political officer of rank, fell more and

The popes and the Lombards.

The popes ask
help of the
Franks.

more into the hands of the pope. But ambitious Lombard kings were continually pressing forward to complete their possession of Italy, and in the time of Charles Martel the danger that they would capture Rome and destroy the incipient papal state became extreme. The popes could get no help from their legal sovereigns, the Roman emperors at Constantinople, and they turned finally to the Franks as the leading nation of the West. Charles Martel was still too deeply occupied with the difficulties which pressed upon him at home to respond to the pope's appeal, but Pippin's hands were free because of the work which his father had done, and he was ready to accept the tempting invitation.

Pippin becomes
king of the
Franks, 751.

Before he actually invaded Italy, he took a step which gave the sanction of law and form to the change of government which had long before taken place. With the express approval of the pope, whose religious influence seems to have been thought great enough, even then, at least to sanction the transfer from one family to another of the divinity that hedges kings, the last Merovingian king was deposed, shorn of his long hair, the mark of royal right among the early Franks, and sent into a cloister. Pippin was made king both with German and with Christian rites, raised on the shield of the warriors after the old fashion, and consecrated with holy oil as no Frankish king had been before him.

Pippin in Italy.

Afterward Pippin twice invaded Italy to protect the pope from the Lombards, and finally he made the pope a gift of a considerable territory along the east coast of Italy in the neighborhood of Ravenna, which the Lombards had lately conquered from the Greek Empire. This gift, which is called "the donation of Pippin," is commonly taken as the starting point of the papal territorial dominion.

As an incident in the history of the Franks, this beginning of connection with Italy is of great importance, first because it drew closer the bond between them and the papacy, and secondly because it brought them into direct contact with Rome, into virtual occupation of it indeed, and so made it easier for them to believe that the empire which they had made was the real successor, was a continuation of the old Roman Empire.

Results for the Franks.

Pippin died in 768 and left his kingdom to his two sons. The death of Carloman in 771 gave to Charlemagne the undivided sovereignty.

The reign of Charlemagne belongs rather to the history of the world than to that of France. He was not a French king; he did not belong even to that portion of the Frankish race from which the future French were formed. He was always a thorough German, and as Germany was as much a part of his realm as France, if he is to be assigned to either nationality it must be to the German. But in truth he belongs to neither; neither nation in the modern sense had at that time any existence; and yet under both as a foundation lie the results of Charlemagne's activity. It is from this point of view that we shall consider his connection with French history.

Charlemagne, 768-814.

See Mombert's "Charles the Great," and Einhard's contemporary "Life" translated by Turner.

The conquests which rounded out his empire all lie outside the later France. The life-long and most obstinate struggle to subdue the Saxons, the invasion of Spain, famous in the epic poetry of the later Middle Ages for the death of Roland, the conquest of the Avars and the lands between the Danube and the Adriatic, the overthrow of the Lombards and the assumption of their iron crown, all have their interest elsewhere. On Christmas Day of the year 800, in the Church of St.

His conquests.

Becomes emperor of Rome.

Peter's, the pope crowned Charlemagne emperor of Rome with the applause of all the people. The act was certainly a right one, for in breadth of territory, in stability and security, in all the elements of strong and



Results.

MOSAIC IN THE LATERAN, ROME.
St. Peter is seated on the throne, on his left is Charlemagne with the banner of the Holy See, on his right Pope Leo III.

good government, the empire of Charlemagne represented in that time all that Rome had represented to the earlier centuries and all that it stood for in the memories of men. The title may have added nothing to his power, but it undoubtedly gave it a further security, created a strong bond of unity between the diverse peoples whom he had brought together by his conquests, a sense of unity, of belonging in a common political system, which very slowly

disappeared, and it gave, very possibly, a permanence to his institutional work which it might not otherwise have had.

It is not from his conquests or his imperial position alone that Charlemagne's right to the title of "Great" is derived. He still more justly deserves it by his efforts to secure the good order and prosperity of his dominions and to restore learning and civilization. It is in these directions also that his reign most concerns the history of France.

For schools Charlemagne could not do very much because there was no source from which teachers and knowledge could be drawn much better than his own empire. He used, however, with great organizing skill the best that he had. Alcuin, the most learned man of his time, was called from England to preside over the "palace school" and to act as a minister of education, and Italy was drawn upon for other teachers. Cathedrals and monasteries were directed to keep up schools for the better education of priests, and there is some evidence that these priests were expected to open public schools in their parishes. Small as the work was which was possible to the time, we can still trace the effect of it in the better quality of the Latin which was written from this date.


In general, the institutional system of Charlemagne's empire was that of the Franks which has been described, the system of local judicial and legislative assemblies, and of counts representing the government. The tendency of the Carolingian reconstruction of the state had been to give new life to these institutions and to force the counts to recognize their responsibility to the central government. Charlemagne's most important innovation is, however, a sign that this tendency had not gone far enough to satisfy his desire for centralization. In order to bring every part of his empire directly under his eye, as it were, to inform himself of its needs, and to be sure that his laws were enforced and every tendency to local independence checked, he divided all the lands that were subject to him into large circuits, each comprising a number of counties. To each of these circuits he sent every year two public officers, usually an ecclesiastical and a secular officer together, who went about from county to county and heard appeals and complaints, saw

Political institutions.

The *missi dominici*.

to it that the laws were enforced, and that the counts and bishops did their duty, and informed Charlemagne of everything that called for the attention of the general government. This was a most effective method of centralization and of holding together such a wide empire, and it did not fall into forgetfulness when that empire went to pieces. We shall see the French kings making

Their continued use.



SILVER PENNIES OF CHARLEMAGNE'S COINAGE.

The first has his monogram, made of the letters of *Karolus*, in the center of the reverse.

Feudalism forming.

use of a very similar institution when they begin to form the modern kingdom of France as the feudal system is declining, and some scholars affirm with much probability that our own circuit judges are directly descended from these *missi dominici* of Charlemagne.

In one other direction, institutional changes were taking place during Charlemagne's reign which had a profound influence upon the future. The feudal system, which was to be very soon the great foe of every king's authority, was rapidly taking shape, and that, too, with the direct encouragement of Charlemagne, who could hardly be expected to foresee the future in this respect. The history of the growth of these institutions, however, belongs naturally in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V.

THE BREAKING UP OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE AND THE RISE OF THE FEUDAL SYSTEM.

It was in the breaking up of Charlemagne's empire on his death that France, using the term of the state and nation to which it has been applied in modern times, first came into existence. His son, Louis the Pious, held the empire together for a short time, but he was too weak a man to be able to control even his own sons, and on his death, in 840, they broke into open civil war over the inheritance. Finally, they agreed to a division among themselves, in the treaty of Verdun in 843—a treaty which has had more to do with shaping the political geography of western Europe than any other ever made. On the west France was set off as a separate kingdom under Charles the Bald, and on the east Germany under Louis the German. Lothaire, the eldest brother, with the title of emperor and a nominal supremacy over his brothers, received Italy and a narrow strip from Italy to the North Sea in the valleys of the Rhone and the Rhine, thus separating France and Germany by a barrier of debatable ground which each has been striving to secure for itself down to the present time.

The beginning
of France, in
the modern
sense.

This kingdom of Charles the Bald, formed in 843, is the first in history to which the name France, in the modern sense, can be rightly applied, and very soon, at least, it began to call itself Francia. Its eastern boundary line ran far inside the present boundaries of

The boundaries
of the original
France.

France, both in the valley of the Rhine and in that of the Rhone. The natural boundaries of which the French have had so much to say in recent times, France never possessed, and the annexations which she has made at various dates in the territory which was assigned to Lothaire have been as truly foreign conquests as those which Napoleon made to the east of the Rhine, for the eastern boundary, which was given to the kingdom of Charles by the treaty of Verdun, corresponded fairly well with the boundary line between the two languages.* The land of Lothaire—Lotharingia, Lorraine part of it came to be called—was in the main a German land, and when the reason for its separate existence had ceased, as it did very soon, it gravitated naturally to the German Kingdom, where it remained without dispute for several centuries.

Lorraine.

Decline of the
Carolingian
power.

The Carolingian kings of France, from Charles the Bald to the end of the dynasty, in 987, almost repeated the history of the Merovingian kings after Dagobert, although personally they were not *fainéant* kings. The unusual abilities of the first princes of the house did not pass on to their descendants, however, and they were without resources of men or money which they could control to enable them to overcome the difficulties of their situation. France was exposed during this whole period, upon all her coasts and in the interior along the

The Northmen.

* The so-called "oath of Strasburg," taken by the two brothers, Charles and Louis, to cement their alliance against Lothaire, shows the separation which had already taken place between the two languages, and is the earliest dated specimen which we have of the modern French or German. It begins:

French: "Pro Deo amur et pro Christian poblo et nostro comun
German: "In Godes minna ind in thes Christianes folches ind unser bedhero
salvament dist di in avant in quant Deus savir
gehaltinissi fon thesemo dage framordes so fram so mir God gewiezi
et podir me dunat," etc.
ind mahd furgibit," etc.

Charles swore in German and Louis in French, that each army might be sure that the proper oath had been taken.

ivers, to the attacks of the Northmen, who had begun their raids while Charlemagne was still alive. They came in ever-increasing numbers and the kings could not beat them off. Finally, in 911, King Charles the Simple allowed some of them under their Duke Rollo to settle permanently in northern France on both sides of the lower Seine, on condition that they should become Christians and recognize the supremacy of the king of France. This supremacy could be only nominal, however, and they formed really a little independent state,

See Keary's
"Vikings."

They occupy
Normandy.



SHIPS OF THE NORTHMEN. From the Bayeux tapestry.

which was called Normandy from them. Other little states, equally independent, were forming themselves at the same time in France. One of the most important of these had Paris for its capital, where the descendants of Robert the Strong, who had gained the titles Count of Paris and Duke of France, had distinguished themselves by the vigor and success of their resistance to the Norman invaders, and were therefore constantly increasing their power because a brave defender was so greatly needed. But besides these two, nearly all the feudal states of France which became famous in later times had already taken shape before the end of the Carolingian

The counts
of Paris.

dynasty. Aquitaine, Toulouse, Brittany, Flanders, Burgundy, Anjou, Auvergne, and many smaller ones had practically escaped from the king's control.

Origin of the
feudal system.

It was in truth the growth of the feudal system, of which these were the extreme results, which deprived the Carolingian kings of France of the last vestiges of their authority and finally seated a new dynasty in their place. Into the history of the formation of the feudal system upon its institutional side it is not necessary for us to go, though it would be possible to trace the feudal institutions back through all the Frankish days to their faint beginnings in the later Roman Empire, and to primitive German practices and ideas which were easily allied with the Roman. It is enough for our present purpose to gain a clear conception of the great prevailing social cause which made these institutions necessary and secured their final triumph everywhere. It was a social condition which would produce a similar result in any stage of history and has done so in many different ages and among many different peoples. Stated in its most general terms, this was the inability of the government to afford protection to its subjects. Life and property make a most strong demand for protection, and if they cannot secure it from one source they will turn to another.* The man of courage and of resources in each neighborhood, who could fortify his house and get together an armed force from his dependents strong enough to defend it, would naturally be resorted to for protection by everybody in his vicinity who was not strong enough to protect himself. He would be able to make practically his own terms. The number of his

It grew up as a
private arrangement for
securing protection.


* A graphic account of the social and political conditions which made the feudal system a temporary necessity will be found in Taine's "Ancient Régime," pages 5-7.

dependents would be constantly increasing as the unprotected sought shelter with him. The land which belonged to him would be constantly enlarging because his poorer neighbors were willing to give up their farms to him and become his tenants in order to gain the right to call upon him to defend them. The more he had the more he would gain, until his territory became really a little state.

It became so too in more than a military sense. The weakness of the government was felt in every direction.

Local govern-
ments are or-
ganized.

It was a general break-down of the state machinery, and the head of the little private state which was forming assumed, almost of necessity, first one function of the general government and then another. He kept the local courts going as his own courts, and organized a kind of supreme court on their model for his whole territory. He began to coin money for the use of his subjects, and to assume the right to



A FEUDAL CASTLE.

make wars and treaties of his own. He could not have done these things if there had been a strong central government to do them. It was of great benefit to his subjects that he should do them if the state did not.

Two other things must be noticed for a full understanding of this process. One is that some of the public

Aided by
Frankish insti-
tutions.

institutions of the Franks aided the growth of these little local states. The office of count, which has been described, was perhaps the most important of these. The functions of government which the king put into the count's hands, as representing the central government in the county, it was very easy for the count to continue to exercise as his own when the king was no longer able to control him. The other fact is that this was a long and slow growth, reaching through five hundred years. The general conditions which favored it made their first appearance in the last days of the Roman Empire. They reappeared under the "do-nothing" kings of the Merovingian dynasty, and again under the later Carolingians. In all these periods, the small private states are to be found, with constantly increasing power and independence. Strong sovereigns, like the great Carolingians, were able to hold them down for the time being and to compel their obedience, but not to destroy the tendency to form them. Indeed, they were obliged to recognize some features of this growing feudal system because they found it practically impossible to get together such an army as they must have in any other way.

A slow process.

Effect upon the
Carolingian
dynasty.

And so, by slow degrees, the whole kingdom divided itself into larger or smaller feudal states. It did so because protection and security could be got in no other way, but the result was fatal to the Carolingian dynasty. They were trying to carry on the government upon the old German, not upon the new feudal, principles, and they had no resources of their own with which they could meet and hope to overcome the powerful dukes and counts whom they had themselves created. First, almost the whole south of France, below the Loire, began to pay no attention whatever to the king of

France, though they still called him their sovereign. And then, the last two or three Carolingians fell almost as completely under the control of the dukes of France as the shadow Merovingian kings had been under the control of their own ancestors. This was the rise of a new dynasty—the dynasty which still lives and claims the right to rule in France, the House of Capet. A new dynasty.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FIRST CAPETIANS—THE FEUDAL KINGS AND THE FEUDAL SYSTEM.

The rise of the
Capetians.

Probably from a
low rank.

THE origin of the Capetian family is not certainly known. There was an early popular belief that they had risen from the lowest classes—one story represents them as being the descendants of a butcher. They were most probably of Saxon origin and the popular belief a mistaken one, but it represents unquestionably the impression produced by the very rapid rise of the family, which took place during the lifetime of their first historical ancestor, Robert the Strong, killed by the Northmen in 866. It was the vigor and success with which they defended the valleys of the Loire and the Seine from these invaders that led to their advancement. Paris and Orleans became the seats of their rule, and they gathered under their control, in that north central region, such numerous fiefs, with the command of these two great rivers of the interior, that they became the most powerful of the great feudatories of the last Carolingian kings—more powerful than the kings, for they had never taken pains to balance the great feudal baronies with lands retained under their own control.

When the new French nation which was forming, and especially when the leaders of the church, began to be dissatisfied with the Carolingians as too weak or too German to rule over France, it was always to this house that they turned for a sovereign to put in their place, and through a whole century before Hugh

Capet there was an alternation* of kings from the old family and the new which runs almost generation for generation. Hugh the Great, duke of France, might have made himself king had he chosen, but he preferred to support the last representatives of the old family, whom, however, he deprived of all real power. His son, Hugh Capet,† was made king largely by the influence of the church in 987—the first of the continuous succession of the Capetians.

The idea of monarchy which is most frequently called up to our minds by the title King of France is that of the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV. where the king is the state; but the monarchy of Hugh Capet was of a very different kind. His election to the office of king gave him no increase of power. It gave him some increase of right—the right to rule as sovereign over all France—but the only resources upon which he could draw to enforce these rights were those which the feudal territories of his family around Paris and Orleans could give him. Outside of these lands, all France was divided among other feudal lords, some of whom, like the dukes of Normandy and of Aquitaine, were almost if not quite as strong as himself.

The new dynasty had but little real power.

These great feudal lords, who became the vassals of Hugh Capet when he became king of France, did not treat him as a king to be obeyed as the earlier Franks had obeyed the strongest Merovingians or Carolingians.

They were feudal kings.

* The alternation runs like this:

New house.

Old house.

Robert, 922.

Charles the Simple, 898 (d. 929).

Rudolf, 923.

Louis IV., 936.

Lothaire, 954.

Louis V., 986.

Hugh Capet, 987.

† Called "Capet" from his practice of wearing the cape, or cope, as lay abbot of the monastery of St. Martin of Tours,

They regarded him, practically, as merely the highest suzerain of France, to be obeyed as their vassals obeyed them, having the right to exact from them only so much as the strict letter of the feudal law allowed, and often not that, if they had some reason for refusing it. If the occasion was one of mere ceremony and show, like the crowning of a young king at Rheims, the vassals might respond in such numbers from all the kingdom as to strike the observers with amazement at the size and brilliancy of the assembly. If it was for some useful but laborious undertaking, like a war with the German emperor, the king might be scarcely able to get together a respectable army. The old general laws of the kingdom, which had come down for a time from the legislation of Charlemagne, had now fallen out of use and remembrance, and the king had no power to make new laws of the kind during the feudal period. Each fief was making a law for itself out of its local customs, and in this way giving rise to those numerous codes of customary law, strictly local in their application, the *coutumes*, which play so large a part in the later history of French law. There were no national courts for the whole kingdom and no supreme court to which cases could be taken on appeal. The king's court was for his vassals only, and each of his vassals had his own court for his subjects with which the king could not interfere. There were no national taxes, and the king's income was limited to what he could derive from those parts of his feudal domain which he held in his own hand, supplemented by the scanty and irregular payments which his vassals were supposed by the feudal law to make on fixed occasions.

There was no
general legis-
lation,


no national
courts,

and no taxes.

This was the actual authority exercised by the king when Hugh Capet was elected to that office. He and

his first successors were more powerful than their Carolingian rivals for two reasons, which, however, had

The sources of the power which they had.



A ROMANESQUE HOUSE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY AT SAINT-GILLES.

nothing to do with the kingship. The first of these was that which has been before referred to, their private resources which they derived from the great fiefs which they had collected in their hands. The Carolingians

Their fiefs.

The church.

had nothing like these and it was a fatal lack. The second was the faithful and strong support which the leaders of the church gave them. The church was in favor of a strong general government which would be able to unite the whole country under one rule and hold disorder in check, and this was not merely because of moral reasons, its desire for peace and the repression of violence, but because its own organization was threatened with dissolution by the breaking of the state into fragments. The support of the church also was not merely a moral one. It had great resources of a material kind and these were at the disposal of the first Capetians.

They desired to be real kings.

But the Capetian kings from the beginning, although they could exercise only so much authority as the vassals' theory of the feudal kingship allowed them, never accepted this theory for themselves. The theory of the royal power which they held to was that which had come down from the times of Charlemagne, and which was still maintained as an ideal though it could not be put into practice. This theory was founded partly on the old absolute monarchy which had developed among the Franks as a result of Clovis's conquests, and partly on ideas of imperial authority which had been absorbed from the Romans. It was a theory of absolute monarchy and of a highly centralized state. The first Capetian kings could not put this theory into practice, but the fact that it existed was of great advantage to them. It was an ideal standard toward which they were constantly striving to advance. As opportunity offered they took one step and another toward the realization of this theory, and what they gained, however slight, they took care to keep.

They were aided by the current theory of the state.

One other circumstance was of great assistance to

them : the fact that they did not die out as the dynasties of Germany did, but that they succeeded one another in an unbroken succession from father to son for more than three hundred years, with no disputed successions and no dangerous minorities. The earliest kings of the dynasty took the precaution to have their sons crowned during their own lifetimes to secure their successions without trouble, but this soon proved unnecessary and was not continued.

A succession of twelve kings in the direct line.

There were then these four circumstances which aided the Capetians in their attempt to make the royal authority greater than that which the great barons were willing to concede. They were : first, that which we may call their own great private fortune ; second, the support of the church ; third, the old theory of the kingship ; and fourth, their continued and undisputed succession.

These paragraphs have also indicated the great work which the Capetian dynasty was to perform for France. There is no modern nation which owes so heavy a debt of gratitude to its ancient line of kings as the French. France, as it exists to-day, and has existed through all modern history, with all its glorious achievements, is their creation and that of no one else. The great task which was before them at the beginning of their history was to unite the feudal fragments of a nation, which were virtually independent states, and which were steadily growing farther away from one another in language, in law, and in habits and feelings, to unite, or we may say, as the French language does, to reunite them under one government and into a real nation, with a common language, and a national enthusiasm. This great task they successfully performed, and this it is that we are to follow through the next six centuries.

The Capetians created France.

The first period which lies next before us extends

No progress at first.

from the accession of Hugh Capet to that of Louis VI., from 987 to 1108, and is a period of almost no advancement toward this goal, but one in which the throne was firmly secured to the dynasty and in which the path to be followed was marked out.

Hugh Capet's reign.

Hugh Capet's reign of nine years was almost wholly occupied with the struggle to secure a recognition everywhere of his right to the crown. His rival was Charles, duke of Lorraine, an uncle of the last Carolingian king and the heir of that dynasty, who was supported by the powerful archbishop of Rheims. Charles maintained the conflict for two or three years with some success, but he was finally captured by Hugh and died in prison, while Hugh was able to depose the archbishop of Rheims and to put in his place his own partisan, Gerbert, who later became Pope Sylvester II. Hugh secured the succession without dispute to his son Robert, whom he had had crowned in the first year of his own reign, but he was not able to leave the authority of the king in France any greater than he found it. He had been obliged to give away large portions of the Capetian domains to purchase support, and he was scarcely recognized as king by the great barons of the south, while of those of the north the duke of Normandy was almost the only one who heartily supported the new dynasty.

Robert,
996 to 1031.

Robert was a king of great good nature, but also of much vigor. He foreshadowed, though without permanent success in them himself, the lines of policy of which the later kings were to make great use. He first attempted by a marriage with his cousin Bertha to secure the large domains which came to her from her first husband, but for some reason the church could not be brought to look favorably upon this particular marriage of cousins, though they let many others pass, and he

was obliged to give up his wife. When the duke of Burgundy died without direct heirs, he attempted to take possession of that fief for the crown, and succeeded after a war of fourteen years. He attempted also to get Lorraine away from Germany, and he annexed various smaller feudal territories to the royal domain.

But almost all that Robert had gained was lost under his son, Henry I. Burgundy was again made independent for the king's brother Robert, and the immediate domain was reduced in size. The reign is most remarkable for the beginning of the strife with the dukes of Normandy which was to last for so many generations. Normandy had long been a faithful ally of the Capetians but it was in its internal affairs as completely independent of the king's control as Germany. Henry resolved to bring it into obedience and attacked it with great bravery and vigor. He might perhaps have been successful if he had not had to deal with the future William the Conqueror. William was a great soldier, though he was then little more than a boy, and he defeated the king in two pitched battles and forced him to abandon his attempt.

Henry I.,
1031-1066.

His successor was Philip I., the first example of a name which the marriage of Henry I. with a Russian princess introduced into western dynasties, the Russian czars claiming a descent from the ancient kings of Macedonia. Philip has suffered severely in history as it has been written until recently, because he did not get on well with the clergy, who had in those days the writing of books entirely to themselves. But he was by no means an indolent or worthless king. He carried on with energy the struggle with Normandy, and when the duke of Normandy became king of England, as he did in 1066, Philip began, as soon as opportunity offered,

Philip I.,
1060-1108.

Begins the long
contest with
Normandy.

He saw the
need of central-
izing the duchy
of France.

the policy which his house was to follow for a hundred years, the attempt to separate the duchy from the crown of England and so to weaken the power of the duke. He seems also to have realized clearly that the first great business of the Capetians must be to reduce to complete obedience the vassals in their own immediate domain, the duchy of France, so that they might be able to command all its resources in the conflict with their more powerful vassals the great barons. Many of these subordinate barons, barons of the second rank, had escaped from all control and had so strongly fortified themselves in their castles that they were able to defy the king. The



FLEET OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR SETTING SAIL.
From the Bayeux tapestry.

task of their reduction Philip hardly more than began, but he left the duchy increased in size and more nearly in hand than when he received it.

The Norman
conquest of
England.

The one event of his reign which had the most decisive influence upon the future of France, the event indeed of this whole period of the greatest consequence, was the conquest of England by William the Conqueror, duke of Normandy. By this event, that connection of the kings of England with the great feudal baronies of France was begun, which placed at the very beginning of the process a most formidable obstacle in the way of

the consolidation of France by the Capetians, and which threatened more than once in the following centuries to deprive them of the crown entirely, but which proved in the end of no little assistance in the growth of a national feeling and a real union of all France, south as well as north, around the Capetian kings.

In his reign occurred, also, the first crusade, an event of hardly less significance though it lies farther from our present field. French barons took a leading part in the first crusade, if the king did not, and so long as the crusades lasted they furnished an outlet for the most restless and irrepressible spirits, and in various ways exhausted the resources of the barons in France and divided their attention, affording assistance to the kings which it is difficult for us to reckon in detail, but which must have been often of great value to them.

The first
crusade.

It was feudal France over which these early Capetian kings ruled in name, and as the customs and especially the class distinctions of feudal France have had a most profound influence on all the later history of that country, even down into the present century, they demand some attention at this point. They were in the main those which we have had described in connection with the Frankish conquest of Gaul, but with some changes and much development, and especially with the class lines more sharply drawn, amounting almost to caste distinctions.

Feudal France

The most extensive change which we have to note is the almost total disappearance of the freeman, or of the class which we should include under the term in modern times. The freeman had not actually disappeared, but the man whom the feudal law called free we should recognize as such only with difficulty and after much

The three
classes, or
"estates."

explanation. The broad line which the feudal society drew between the classes which composed it was that of occupation, and that principle of classification will give us the simplest results. There were three classes clearly marked and sharply distinguished: the preaching and praying class, the clergy, called the "first estate"; the the fighting class, the nobles, or "second estate"; and the laboring class, or the class which supported the other two and produced whatever property was produced in feudal times, called the "third estate."

The clergy and the nobles formed the upper classes; to labor with the hands, or to engage in any form of occupation whose object was the production of wealth, was a mark of inferiority. The third estate was further

The third
estate fell into
two classes.



WHEELWRIGHT AND COOPER.
From a window of the Cathedral of
Bourges.

subdivided, however, into two classes, the extreme members of which were clearly distinguished but which in the intermediate grades passed into one another by almost imperceptible steps. The lower of these two classes was called the serf; the higher, the *roturier* or villain, though the name villain was sometimes applied

also to members of the lower class, usually with some qualifying word, like serf-villain, to show the exact meaning in which it was used. The villain proper was considered by the law of the time to be a free man, that is, he was free in person, but he was not free in occupation. To obtain a piece of land to

The villain.

cultivate for the support of himself and his family, he must agree to pay to the owner of the land certain fixed sums at regular intervals, and usually also to give so many days of labor during the year upon the land which was cultivated as the lord's "home farm."

A tendency to fixed services.

The serf was also subject to the same payments and to the same necessity of working upon the lord's land, but there was this difference between the two cases, that the payments made by the villain and the number of days' labor which he must give in each season of the year were all definitely fixed for each piece of land, and the lord had no right to demand anything more from him. If he wished, the villain could at any time leave the land and go where he pleased by simply turning it over again to the lord from whom he had at first obtained it, of course taking the risk himself, and it was a great one in those days, that he might not find anything to do elsewhere and would starve to death, or that he would be arrested as a vagabond and punished severely because he had no lord to be responsible for his good behavior. In all these respects the serf was unlike the villain, and this forms the distinction between the two classes. The serf was supposed to belong in person to his lord, like the ancient slave from whom he was descended, though he could not now be removed from the land which he held. But, since he was his lord's personal property, all that he had, of course, belonged to his lord, and therefore he was subject to unlimited exactions at his lord's will and to work on his land whenever called upon to do so. He could not leave the land, and if he ran away he could be pursued like a fugitive slave and brought back; though after a time the law secured him his liberty if he was not recovered by his lord within a year

The serf,

with services unlimited.

and a day. If he gave his children in marriage outside the domain he must pay for the privilege, because this was diminishing his lord's working force.

This was the general distinction between the free villain and the serf; the first was subject only to fixed exactions and was otherwise free, while the serf and all that he had was entirely at the lord's disposal. It will readily be understood, however, that the condition of the serf was better than that of the slave of the earlier time whose place he had taken. He was progressing toward the condition of the Roman *colonus*, or he had quite reached it. He had a home of his own and a legal family; whatever his lord might allow him to keep from the products of his labor was his property; and it was for the interest of the lord that his serfs should be as well contented as those of his neighbors.

We are accustomed to think of the feudal system as weighing very heavily on the lower classes, and so it did as compared with the modern system of things. But in forming our opinion of the place which the feudal system occupies in history, we should remember the conditions which went before it, and we should compare the situation of the laboring class at the close of the feudal period with that at the beginning. As a matter of fact, the tendency of the feudal system,* or of the general situation which produced the feudal system, to improve the condition of the lowest classes was very strong, in spite of what may have happened to unfortunate individuals, or now and then to large numbers in especially unfavorable times. In the first place it was a very great step in advance when the distinction

Serfage represents a stage above slavery.

How the feudal system aided the laboring class.

* Strictly speaking the serf class did not form a part of the feudal system. Each of these classes had its own separate organization, and its own system of law. The clergy were subject to the canon law; the nobility had the feudal law; while the interests of the serf were regulated by the manorial, or "customary" law.

between bond and free was taken from the person and placed upon the land. Under the feudal system the land determined everything. A certain piece of land in the lord's domain was fixed as always held by a servile tenure. If it was taken to be cultivated by a free villain he was treated while he held it as a serf, and he ran some risk of having the fact that he was personally free entirely forgotten. A certain other piece was always held by a free tenure. If the lord granted it to a serf he was under obligation to treat him as a free villain, so far as that land was concerned, and in time, if he kept the land, he would become so in reality.

Land the
determining
factor.

Another characteristic fact of the feudal system which was of great assistance to the lowest class was this, that the law was custom, or that custom made the law. If the lord limited himself in his demands upon his serfs to certain fixed sums, or to particular seasons of the year,

Custom the
source of law.



MASONS, STONECUTTERS, AND SCULPTORS.
From a window of the Cathedral of Bourges.

until this practice grew into the custom of the manor, he ceased to have the right to vary it, and the serf had become a free villain because he was no longer subject to arbitrary exactions.

The most effective, however, of all the contemporary

Competition.

influences was competition. Laborers were not numerous. The lord must keep those he already had from running away by giving them as good terms as did any one else. If he had new land, clearings, or drained land to bring into cultivation, he frequently tried to tempt away the serfs or villains of other lords by offering especially attractive terms. Other causes not belonging properly to the feudal system came in to assist this process, with the result that by the close of the feudal age serfage had practically disappeared from the most favorably situated regions of Europe.

In this account of the laboring class nothing has been



FARRIER. From a window of the Cathedral of Bourges.

The town population.

said of the population of the towns. There came to be in the course of time a distinction between the people of the towns, or the *bourgeois*, and the agricultural laborers of the country, but this was a distinction which the original feudal classification did not recognize. It was made in the course of the feudal age by new forces with which the feudal system had nothing to do and which produced this result in spite of it. Strictly the town was a part of some lord's domain. Its inhabitants were his villains or serfs. They might be either. They did not pay for land to cultivate, but they paid for the privilege of carrying on their business, whatever it was, within the lord's domain, and they were subject to the

Reckoned as villains or serfs.

taille, or tallage, where the noble would have paid the more honorable "aid." By organization within the walls of the town and by the strength which came from their growing numbers and wealth, the townspeople might be able to force the lord to grant them greater liberty, perhaps even to raise them to the rank of a noble, by making the organization which the town had formed his vassal for the land which it occupied, in which case it was called in France a *commune*. But if this was done it was always a concession by a special bargain or contract, as when a lord granted unusually good terms in order to secure more villains; it was not something which the feudal law itself conceded to a town, however large or rich.

The *commune*.

At the head of the feudal society, and the real ruling class of France during this time, to the exclusion of all other classes and of the king himself, was the nobility, though it was called the second estate, titular precedence being granted the clergy out of reverence for their spiritual office. The noble was the man who held a fief, that is, who held the land of another and paid for it, not servile, that is, money or labor rent, but honorable or noble services, chiefly military service. It might be a whole province, like the great duchy of Normandy, held of the king, or it might be a few acres, or a fraction of a village even, furnishing just income enough to support and arm the feudal warrior. If it was held upon military or other honorable service, the holder was noble. He did not work for his own support but was supported by the labor of others. His business was fighting. There were very numerous gradations of rank and power among the nobles, from the greatest barons, like the dukes of Aquitaine or Burgundy, through the vassals who held of them, counts and viscounts, and the

The feudal
barons.

still smaller nobles, simple lords, *sires* or *seigneurs*, down to the holder of the smallest fief.

The "domain."

The territory of all the larger fiefs was divided into two distinct parts : one the "domain," cultivated for the lord's benefit by his serfs and villains, and the most important source of his support ; the other, divided into fiefs and sub-fiefs which he granted to vassals of his own who furnished him with his little feudal army, and who like himself might be more or less independent of their lord. The consideration and rank of the lord in the feudal hierarchy, however, depended upon the number of these vassals. In theory every noble who held land held it of some one above him, whose vassal he was, up to the king, who held of God. But the theory was imperfectly realized in practice.

Vassals and serfs are two distinct classes.

The feudal courts.

Besides military service, the vassal owed to his lord service in his court ; that is, all the vassals came together in an assembly and thus formed a court which attended to all the judicial business which arose between the vassals, and which acted also as the lord's council, and, in serving this purpose, did the work which was the nearest to legislation of anything in the feudal age. The right of holding his own court was one of the most valuable of the prerogatives of the feudal lord, for it was not merely a very effective means of keeping control of his vassals, but, from the fines which it collected, it was one of his most lucrative sources of income.

The "aids."

The vassal also owed the duty of paying the feudal aids. These were sums of money to be paid on three fixed occasions : to ransom the lord when taken prisoner, and to pay the expenses of marrying his eldest daughter and of knighting his eldest son—a fourth was paid in France during the time of the crusades when the

lord went on a crusade to the Holy Land. These three, military and court service, and the payment of aids, together with a constant duty of fidelity and loyalty, constituted the chief duties of the vassal. The lord had, however, other rights over his vassal which were of financial value to him. The chief of these were the right of wardship when the vassal was a minor, of selecting the husband of an heirless, and the right of relief or the fine which the son paid when he succeeded to the fief which his father had held.

The first Capetian kings of France, it will be remembered, were great barons of the kingdom as well as kings. They were dukes of France, their duchy lying in a roughly shaped oval around Paris and Orleans.

This territory was called domain, the royal domain, as the immediate property of the king, in a somewhat different sense from that in which the word was used in connection with every fief; for this duchy was divided also into the two sorts of land described above, that cultivated for the king, and that held by the nobles who were his vassals as duke, not as king. Many of these were as independent as if they had been the greatest barons of the kingdom, and it was the labor of reducing them to submission which the kings had first to undertake as a step to greater labors, as has already been said. The enlargement of the royal domain in this sense, that is, the bringing of a larger and larger number of the nobles of the second and lower ranks to hold



SHOP OF A MONEY CHANGER.
From a window of the Cathedral of Bourges.

The royal domain

was the territory directly ruled by the king.

This was the real kingdom of France.

their lands immediately of the king, instead of from some great duke who stood between the king and them, was the construction of France geographically. France grew step by step as the great barons, those of the highest rank, disappeared and the king took their place.

The church
feudalized,

The church of the period was almost a reproduction, within its own sphere of action, of the feudalism of the nobility. There was the same variety of gradation in rank from the archbishop down to the parish priest. The endowment lands were treated as fiefs, and the chief revenues were derived from domains cultivated by the serfs and villains who belonged to the church, and from the tithes paid by other cultivators. There was, however, this very great difference, that the church represented a much more complete and thorough unity than could any feudal state, a unity derived from the ideas which prevailed in the Roman Empire when the church was taking on its organization. This unity was never lost sight of, but was maintained by the machinery of the church during the days of feudal separation. Its existence and the emphasis placed upon it were reasons which rendered the church ready to support the kings in their efforts to reëstablish a government for the whole national territory.

but still a
united whole.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FOUNDATION OF FRANCE AND OF THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY.

THE traditional history of France reckons Louis VI. the first of the great Capetian kings. And while it may not be exactly true that the policy which his dynasty was to follow to such great results was first marked out by him, or that he realized as clearly the goal to be reached as some of his successors, still he is really the first of the line who left the monarchy greatly strengthened by his reign, and, measured by his success, he is the first of the great Capetians.

Louis VI.,
1108-1137.

Begins to construct the royal power.

Louis inherited from his father a body of enormous frame and he grew more corpulent with advancing years, so that he has been known to later times as Louis the Fat. But his size did not interfere with his energy. He had a keen enjoyment of the physical effort and danger of the battle and the chase, and he thoroughly deserved the name by which he was also known to his own time, Louis le Batailleur. Even in the last ten years of his life, when his size no longer allowed him to mount his horse, he maintained his energy, and Louis the Fat must not be translated Louis the Sluggish.

Called "the Fat," and "the Fighter."

His labors in behalf of his dynasty were directed to two principal ends. In the first place, the duchy of France, the great resource of the Capetians in their struggle for the control of the kingdom, must be brought into better obedience. Some of the barons of this duchy even in the neighborhood of Paris had thrown off

Two leading objects.

all regard for the king and were really in a state of perpetual war with him. They had strongly fortified their castles and lived like the later robber barons, plundering the defenseless, the merchant on the highway, and the peasant on the lands of the church. The



A ROMANESQUE CHURCH OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY. Toulouse.
The tower is a century later.

To centralize
his own feudal
lands.

king was often treated with open contempt and was scarcely strong enough himself to use the ordinary highway where these barons were levying contributions. To reduce these men to order Louis made one of the main objects of his life. He began his war upon them even before the death of his father when he was hardly

twenty years old, and he kept it up until within a year or two of his own death. He captured and destroyed their castles and threw the barons into prison, and at the end of his reign the resources and strength of the king had greatly increased from this one cause alone.

But, in the second place, Louis was not so completely taken up with the interests of his duchy as to forget that he was king also. He asserted the rights of the monarch over the great barons wherever opportunity offered, though with less success than he obtained within the duchy. When the county of Flanders fell vacant, he asserted the right of the king to select the new count, but his candidate was not popular, and when he was killed at a siege Louis did not keep up the contest. He maintained with more success the right of the bishop of Clermont to appeal to the king against the injustice of his feudal superior, the count of Auvergne, even against the protest of the duke of Aquitaine, the count's overlord, and he compelled the duke to take an oath of allegiance to himself. But the greatest baron of all in France, and the great enemy of Louis, was Henry I., king of England and duke of Normandy. The duchy had been separated from the kingdom on the death of William the Conqueror, but Henry had succeeded in uniting them again by defeating his brother Robert and throwing him into prison. Louis tried to keep up the division by supporting the cause of Robert's son William, but without success. It would seem as if the power of Henry ought to have been much more than a match for that of Louis, especially as Henry found numerous and strong allies. The count of Champagne, on the east of the duchy of France, the nephew of Henry, was as ceaseless an enemy of Louis as he could have been if he had clearly foreseen that the success of

To be a real king over the great barons.

Henry I., of England, as a French baron.

Combinations against Louis.

War with
Germany.

the Capetians would some time destroy the independence of the county of Champagne. He and the English were continually aiding the rebellious barons of the duchy of France, and this it was which enabled them to maintain the conflict with Louis through so long a portion of his reign. The German emperor, Henry V., was a son-in-law of the English Henry, and he also was at one time drawn into the alliance against Louis and threatened a great invasion of France. But Louis was able to collect against him an army of unusual size and the emperor thought better of his purpose. It was in this campaign that we first find used on an important occasion the famous standard of France, the *oriflamme*, which was the standard of the royal abbey of Saint Denis, and the French battle-cry, which was to be heard so often in the long wars with the English, "Montjoie-Saint Denis." At last the king lost an ally who had been a long enemy of the Normans when Henry's daughter Matilda, the widow of the emperor, was married to the count of Anjou. It may, indeed, be counted a real triumph for Louis that he did not allow any of these great combinations to overcome him, but that he could face the English and Normans with as much strength at the end as at the beginning of his reign.

Anjou marries
the heiress of
England and
Normandy.

Eleanor of
Aquitaine and
her great
inheritance.

This also fell to
Anjou.

In the last year of Louis's life an opportunity came to him which opened a prospect of the greatest increase of power, and which he made haste to use. William X., duke of Aquitaine, died, leaving his great territory, in area the largest of the feudal states in France, to his daughter Eleanor with the expressed wish that she should be married to Prince Louis, who had been already crowned king to make sure of his succession. This marriage was to prove in the end of no assistance to the Capetians, but it must have seemed to Louis VI.

the most decided advantage by far that he had gained, for it more than doubled the royal domain.



TOWN HALL OF BRUGES. Type of communal bell-tower.

It was during the reign of Louis VI. that the movement of the cities to secure freedom of local government for themselves first assumed large proportions in northern France. Growing trade and manufactures had given

The rise of the cities.

the cities wealth which they could use. Their feudal lords, interested in the crusades or pressed by rivalries among themselves, had reasons for not refusing an offer of ready money, and the towns began to buy, with the free consent of the lord, or to force him to sell to them, charters, attested by all the forms of the feudal chancery, by which they were granted the right to manage their own affairs, to elect local officers, to keep order within their walls and in their markets, and to raise an armed force to defend themselves. If this charter went so far as to give the town complete local liberty, to make it a vassal of the lord with all the local independence of the vassal when he had discharged his few feudal obligations, then the town became a *commune*, and was almost a free republic. Very many of the charters did not go so far as this, but left the lord some rights of interference, some influence over the choice of local officers, and some share in the administration of justice, but in every case the charter emancipated the city by distinctly specifying just how far the lord could go. It has been often said of Louis VI. that he did all that he could to encourage this movement with the hope of weakening the feudal barons, and that he introduced a permanent royal policy of this kind. This is hardly true of Louis, or of the kings in general. They seem to have been opposed to the communes as a matter of general policy, and very few were ever formed within the royal domain. Whenever outside their domain they favored a commune, it was because they had some special thing to gain by it. Toward the towns with more limited rights they showed themselves more favorable.

The *commune*.

The kings and the cities.

Louis VII.,
1137-1180.

The material strength and the public respect which Louis VI. had gained for the crown were only slightly increased in the long reign of his son Louis VII., who

is remembered chiefly for having divorced his queen Eleanor and having given up the great possessions which she had brought him.

He had wisdom enough to keep in office the great minister of his father's last years, the abbot Suger, as long as he lived, and to follow in most things his wise counsels. This did not save him, however, from his first serious mistake, which was to join the second crusade, in 1147, in spite of the protests of Suger, and to be absent from France for three years. He left the government in the hands of Suger, but it taxed that minister's skill to the utmost to keep down the feudal insubordination which broke out in the absence of the king, and to prevent a threatened revolution which had for its object the dethroning of Louis in favor of his brother Robert. The second crusade was a complete failure, and Louis gained from it only unpopularity, and not the glory which he sought.

The abbot
Suger.

The second
crusade.

This crusade seems also to have determined him to commit his second great mistake, looked at from a political point of view—the divorce of Eleanor. Louis and Eleanor were entirely incompatible in character and temperament. Louis was of a mild and effeminate character and somewhat superstitious. Eleanor's character is well known to us from English history and legend. Her masculine mind felt only contempt for her weaker husband, and she does not seem to have concealed it. She said he was a monk and not a king. Her conduct during the crusade, on which she accompanied the king, seems really to have been blameworthy, at least to have been enough finally to determine Louis to be rid of her. But he does not seem to have had strength of character enough to carry out his plan so long as Suger lived. On the death of the

Louis and El-
eanor could not
get on together.

Divorced.

abbot, in 1152, the divorce was at once pronounced.

Eleanor marries
Henry II. of
England.

The worst consequence of this action was not the loss of the great duchy of Aquitaine. Within a few weeks Eleanor was married to young Henry of Anjou. He was the son of the count of Anjou and the empress Matilda, daughter of Henry I. of England. To the English possessions in France he added those of his father, and by an arrangement with King Stephen of England he was to inherit that kingdom on Stephen's death, an event which happened shortly after his marriage with Eleanor. He thus possessed in his own right

The great
possessions of
Henry in
France.

all the northwest quarter of France down to the Loire, Normandy, Brittany, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine. Now his marriage gave him all the southwest quarter, from the Loire to the Pyrenees. It was more than half the kingdom of France as that had been established by the treaty of Verdun, and more than three times the domain immediately under the control of the French king. Henry's ambition naturally extended beyond these territories, and at one time he seemed about to establish his rule across the whole south of France and beyond the Rhone to the present boundaries of Italy.

He plans an Angevin empire.

Even without this extension, it was a most formidable danger with which the Angevin dominion threatened the Capetian house. If the Angevins could unite and consolidate their French lands into a compact state, what future would there be for the Capetians? Would not their lands be gradually absorbed and the future French nation be formed and ruled by the rival dynasty? But this task was one which was too great even for the genius of Henry II. There was no natural bond of union between the countries north of the Loire and those south of it, rather the contrary. Dialect, manners, and feelings were different, and Henry had no higher

Will France be
Angevin or
Capetian?

title, as Louis had, to form the basis of an artificial union. He was duke of this and count of that, but king of nothing in France, and England, though a source of men and money for war against the king of France, would have been a source of weakness rather than of strength if the Angevins had made the centralization of their French possessions the leading object of their policy.

Why not
Angevin?

Against this formidable danger Louis could directly oppose only a limited force, but he followed with some skill the already established Capetian policy of aiding the enemies of England and of keeping up the frequent quarrels in the English royal family. It was on this principle that he granted favor and protection to Thomas à Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury, when he took refuge in France from the anger of Henry. And it was not a little to the credit of Louis that at the same time the pope, Alexander III., found a refuge in France during his conflict with the great Hohenstaufen emperor, Frederick Barbarossa. Louis gained much greater practical advantage, however, from his support of Henry's turbulent and rebellious sons in their wars against their father, and by their means constant division and civil war were maintained in the English dominions during all the last years of Louis's life.

What Louis
VII. could do.

It was under Louis's son Philip II., called Augustus, that the first great step was taken in uniting France under the Capetian kings. Whatever may have been the reason for giving the name Augustus to Philip, he certainly earned the distinction by the great successes which were won by his skill. He had at least two of the indispensable elements of political genius: he knew the proper means to use to accomplish his end, and he knew how to be patient and to wait until the proper time had

Philip II.,
Augustus,
1180-1223.

He was a real
statesman.

come. He had a solid foundation upon which to build in the results of the work which had been done in the past eighty years, but still at the beginning of his reign he was only one among the great feudal princes of France, with the title of king and certain shadowy rights over the others but with no real power of governing France. There was indeed no France as yet. At the close of his reign, the land which the king was ruling directly had been multiplied by three, and he was easily more than a match for any one of the great barons or for any likely combination of them. Only the duke of Aquitaine could meet him on anything like equal terms, and this only because he was also king of England. And not merely had the territory grown, the machinery of government had kept pace with it, and, as France grew, it was growing into a centralized and absolute monarchy. This was the work of Philip Augustus.

He founds the absolute monarchy.

He was only fifteen years old when he began to reign, but he was not a boy, and within half a dozen years he had broken up and forced into submission a great combination of the northeastern feudal barons against him, including in it the duke of Burgundy and the counts of Flanders and of Champagne, and had annexed to the royal domain the counties of Vermandois, Valois, and Amiens. But the great struggle of his life was against the vast power of the English in France, and his greatest successes were won from them.

His first successes.

Henry II. lived until 1189, but his sons and his wife were against him during all his later years. His heart was broken at last by the treason of his favorite son John, and it was an omen for the future that the young Philip, making the most of the crowd of misfortunes which covered the English king, forced Henry—the

The failure of Henry II.'s plans in France.

greatest king England had had, and one of the greatest of all her kings—to surrender to him his claims upon the county of Auvergne, the first break in the English dominions.

Philip was of course in alliance with the revolted sons of Henry against their father, and when Richard became king these friendly relations were kept up for a time. It was on the third crusade that the inevitable trouble between the two kings broke out. Saladin had captured Jerusalem in 1187, and all Europe was roused to a new crusading enthusiasm to avenge the indignity and to ward off the threatening danger from the Christian state in the Holy Land. The young kings of France and England caught the spirit, but it was not merely because they were young, for the old emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Frederick Barbarossa, joined them. Philip's heart, however, was never really in the crusade. It was in his difficult task at home, and he went at last only because of the serious remonstrances of the pope. The quarrel began between Philip and Richard before they reached the Holy Land over real or fancied affronts which passed in Sicily, and as soon as some slight success had been gained in Palestine Philip abandoned the crusade and returned to France to begin his proper business and to take advantage of the absence of Richard. John was a fit tool for the purposes of Philip and together they hoped to make sure of Richard's lands. John was to be king in his brother's place and Philip was to have Normandy. Richard's imprisonment in Germany on his return from Palestine seemed to be intended to aid them, but his sudden release overturned all their plans.

Philip was no match for Richard in the field, and was defeated by him in three successive battles, so that as

Richard, the
Lion-heart, and
the third
crusade.

Philip too
modern a man
for a crusader.

Philip's opportunity comes at last.

long as Richard lived he made no progress. When John became king, in 1199, Philip's opportunity had come. At the outset, Philip made a friendly treaty with John, but he was only waiting a better moment. John was by nature a traitor to every interest confided to him if any selfish motive tempted him, and it was an act of especial unfaithfulness, as the feudal society regarded it, which gave Philip an occasion for action. He stole away the affianced bride of the young Hugh de Lusignan, the heir of one of his vassals in Poitou. His vas-



SEAL OF ARTHUR OF BRITTANY (1202).

sal appealed at once to Philip, the feudal lord of John as count of Poitou, for justice, and when John refused obedience to the repeated summons of Philip's court of vassals, he was condemned, in strict accordance with the feudal law, to lose his fiefs, and Philip was given legal authority to take possession of

them. He took up at the same time the cause of Arthur, John's nephew, who had been deprived of Brittany, his rightful inheritance from his father.

John displayed in general only indolence and carelessness in his own defense, and almost let things drift as they would. But one sudden burst of energy at the beginning of the war enabled him to capture the young Arthur, who soon disappeared, no doubt murdered and possibly by John's own hand. While it was not for this

John murders Arthur.

murder that John was condemned by Philip's court, as was once said, still it aided Philip by the feeling which it excited against John. In the same year, the great castle which defended Normandy, the château Gaillard, was captured, and in the next year Rouen surrendered. John lost in this war all his possessions north of the Loire, and they all passed into the king's domain. This was an enormous increase of power for Philip. There were no more dukes of Normandy, or counts of Maine or Anjou or Touraine, in the old sense. The king took their place and added all the resources of these great baronies to those which he possessed before. This single success gave him control of the Seine and Loire, and carried his borders both to the English Channel and to the Atlantic. He stood now clearly above all the great barons of France, and the kingdom, which had been only a name, must soon be a reality.

Philip's great conquests

almost create the kingdom.

John was occupied for some years after this with his troubles at home, with the resistance of his barons, who would not quietly submit to his arbitrary methods of government, and with his conflict with the pope, Innocent III., over the election of Stephen Langton to the archbishopric of Canterbury. These were the difficulties which led in the end to the Magna Charta. At one time Philip was about to invade England as the ally of the pope when John averted the blow by submitting to Innocent and becoming his vassal for the kingdom of England.

John, hindered for a time,

But John had not abandoned the hope of recovering his possessions in France, and finally he was able to bring about a coalition against Philip from which he hoped great success. John's nephew, Otto IV., the emperor of the time, with the count of Flanders, and many lesser barons in the Rhine Valley, joined the

finally forms a great alliance against Philip.

Philip gains a
great victory,
1214.

league. The plan was that John should strike at Philip through his duchy of Aquitaine in the southwest, while the others were to attack him from the northeast. But John was driven back by Philip's son Louis, and Otto and the count of Flanders were completely defeated by Philip in the great battle of Bouvines. It was a fatal battle for all the allies. The count of Flanders remained long a prisoner in Philip's hands; Otto IV., the head of the Guelfs, lost the crown of Germany, which passed once more into the hands of the rival family, the Hohenstaufen; and John returned to England to be forced by his barons to grant the Magna Charta in 1215. The feudal states which were lost by John never returned into the possession of the English, who were shut up henceforth to the inheritance of Eleanor south of the Loire. The great popular rejoicings in the king's lands which followed his victory at Bouvines showed that already a national feeling had begun to grow up in that part of France.

The crusade
against the
Albigenses.

In the last half of Philip's reign the cruel war against the Albigenses opened the prospect of as great an accession of territory in the southeast of France as Philip had made in the northwest. The Albigenses were heretics and therefore it was the duty of all true Christians to destroy them utterly. There were many of them dwelling in the great county of Toulouse which had never been more than nominally subject to the king of France, its count ruling "by the grace of God," and as the count of that day, Raymond VI., refused to abandon them to the mercies of their persecutors a crusade was preached against him. In the war that followed his county was taken from him and given to Simon de Montfort, the father of the Simon de Montfort who won in the next generation a better renown in English his-

tory. In this war Philip took no part, but he could easily see that the new count could not be as strong as the old and that the independence of one of the greatest of the remaining of the feudal states was being destroyed.

The first gain in southern France.

Though Philip II.'s greatest services to France were in the annexations that he made, yet in the development of the future government machinery his services were not slight. Up to this time the chief executive and administrative officer of the Capetians had been the *prévôt*, who looked after a small division of the domain, collected the royal revenues, held the local courts, and summoned the vassals to their military service. These officers could be held under good control while the domain was small, but as it increased in size it became more difficult to do so ; their office had become hereditary in their families ; and the Capetian kings were having the same trouble with the office that the Carolingians had had with the office of count. Early in his reign Philip Augustus introduced new officers, the *baillis*, who had under their control a much larger territory and were a kind of *prévôt* over the *prévôts*, responsible for the same things, but chiefly for seeing that the *prévôts* did their duty and did not abuse their opportunities, and for looking after the king's interests in their districts. This proved of great advantage to the royal administration, for both Philip and his successors took great pains to prevent these officers from passing out of their control. They especially adopted the expedient of moving them frequently about from one district to another to prevent both fixity of tenure and the growth of local interests. For example, one of the *baillis* of the thirteenth century, who wrote a famous book on French customary law, held the office in seven different districts, spending on the average three years in each.

Philip's new executive machinery.

Like the *missi dominici* of Charlemagne.

Philip makes
use of the
towns.

Philip also took the chartered towns under his special care, wherever he could in this way extend the royal power at the expense of the feudal, and he asserted the right of the king to protect their liberties even in the feudal states not directly subject to his rule. He took

pains also to fortify and beautify the cities, he encouraged the growth of commerce, and favored the resort of foreign merchants to the French markets. The University of Paris, which gave the city so great a European reputation and influence during the next following centuries, was given its organization in this reign, and

The university.



SEAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS
(1292).

Modern literature begins.

this was the age also of the famous lyric poetry of the *trouvères* and the *troubadours* in the two languages of France, in the north the *langue d'oïl*, and in the south the *langue d'oc*.

The king much stronger than before.

One of the things that most strikingly illustrates the stronger position of the king at the close of the reign of Philip Augustus is the fact that first of all the Capetian kings he did not think it necessary to have his son crowned during his own lifetime. The crown was now the secure possession of the family. It was more than two hundred years since the accession of Hugh Capet to little more than the empty title. It was a long time measured in years, but measured by resources and opportunities the progress had been great, and now there was a real king and, in some degree at least, a real France.

CHAPTER VIII.

STEPS TOWARD ABSOLUTISM.

THE short reign of Philip's son, Louis VIII., was a continuation of his father's conquests. A short war with the English gave him the part of Poitou still unconquered, with the important port of La Rochelle, and threatened to confine the English behind the Garonne. But in the midst of these conquests Louis was called away to the more brilliant prospect opened by the breaking out again of the Albigensian war on the attempt of Raymond VII. to recover his hereditary dominions. Simon de Montfort's son, Amaury, was not strong enough to defend himself and ceded his rights to Louis, who led a new crusade against the heretics with the sanction of the church. Louis died before the complete conquest of the country, but a part of the territory of the *langue d'oc* remained permanently annexed to the royal domain.

Louis VIII.,
1223-1226.

Further gains.

Louis IX. was only eleven years of age on the death of his father, but his mother, Blanche of Castile, was a woman of remarkable energy and ability, well able as regent to continue the Capetian policy. But the minority of the king with the regency of a woman was the opportunity of the feudal barons. They were now clearly conscious of the end to which the development of the monarchy was leading, and they saw the necessity of combination to resist it and the wisdom of using such an opportunity as the present. Their league embraced the whole land, north and south, and barons great and

Louis IX.,
1226-1270.

A feudal
reaction.

small, from the count of Brittany to lords of the old domain in the neighborhood of Paris ; the king of England and the king's own uncle, a brother of Louis VIII., gave it their support. Their demands, if granted, would have completely overthrown the Capetian monarchy, restored the old feudal independence and confusion, and destroyed France. Blanche of Castile met this danger with the utmost courage and skill. She divided and broke up the coalition, which depended too much upon help from the weak Henry III. of England, isolated its most dangerous members, and finally won new gains for the monarchy from the very attempt which had been made to destroy it. The count of Toulouse, who had recovered the western part of his county, was forced to submit to the king as no count of Toulouse had ever done before, and to marry his daughter, with the right of succession, to the king's brother Alphonso.

The barons did not want a nation created.

A victory for the monarchy.

Another feudal rebellion.

Soon after Louis had taken the government into his own hands, he had a similar coalition of the barons to meet. This had its origin among the barons of Poitou, who were displeased at being placed under the king's brother, the new count of Poitou, but it was joined by the count of Toulouse, by Henry III. of England, by the king of Aragon, who feared the loss of feudal possessions which he claimed in Languedoc, and by other barons of the center and south. Louis did not prove himself a great soldier. There was hardly opportunity to do that, but he acted rapidly and with decision. The count of La Marche, whose intrigues had brought on the rebellion, was forced to submit. Henry III. was completely defeated after a ridiculous campaign. The count of Toulouse was obliged to renew the engagements which would give his county to the king's brother at his death, which occurred a few years later.

This was the last attempt of the original feudal baronage to resist the progress of the royal authority. Says William of Nangis, the chronicler of Louis's reign: "From this time the barons of France undertook nothing against their king, the anointed of the Lord, seeing clearly that the hand of the Lord was with him."

The last of this kind.

But Louis's reign was not marked by great additions to the royal domain. His part in the formation of France was of another sort. Indeed, his conscience troubled him regarding his right to all the conquests of his grandfather, and in 1259 he gave back to the English some of those fiefs in central France, and received in return from Henry III. a renunciation of all claims to the other great provinces which Philip Augustus had taken from his father, Normandy, Brittany, Maine, Anjou, and Poitou. He had made the preceding year a treaty with the king of Aragon by which he had exchanged claims of the French kings south of the Pyrenees for some of those of the kings of Aragon in Languedoc. These acts are so opposed to the traditional Capetian policy that their wisdom has been much discussed, but they certainly secured two things which Louis regarded as of the utmost importance, peace for the present and for the future a legal title.

Louis IX. not a conqueror,

These treaties may be taken also as typical of his character. He is the only king whose title of "Saint" has become as firmly fixed in history as that of "Great" for other kings, and to his canonization modern criticism has no objection to make. He was not a Louis the Pious. He was no tool of the church, and he resisted bishops and popes with determined energy when he thought they were in the wrong. But he did believe that what was right should always be

but a saint.

Not like Charlemagne's son.

done no matter what the cost might be, and he held himself to fidelity to this principle as uncompromisingly as he did all who were under his authority. He would punish the highest noble in the land who did injustice, but he punished also his own officers whose zeal for the king's interests had led them to infringe the undoubted feudal rights of the barons. The two great ambitions of his life were to make peace and justice prevail everywhere, and to recover the Holy Land for the Christians by another great crusade.

His character
aids the
growth of the
royal power.

In the first he was more successful than in the second, for not merely did his own subjects recognize his perfect justice by bringing to him their most important disputes for decision, so that his personal character helped to develop the idea of a national supreme court and of the king as the fountain of justice, but foreign states also laid their disputes before him as a kind of international arbitrator.* His crusades, however, were failures: the first, from 1248 to 1254, in which he attempted to secure in Egypt a footing for the conquest of Palestine; and the second, at the end of his reign, in which he attacked Tunis in Africa, persuaded by his brother, the king of Sicily, who had his own ends to serve. The age of the real crusades was now closing. The ardor for them which he felt was, in the case of a reigning sovereign, a survival "which the popes themselves no longer understood," as a recent French historian says,† and these

His two
crusades were
both failures.

* The most famous case of this sort was the question laid before him from England, as to whether the king, Henry III., should be bound by the arrangement, called the "Provisions of Oxford," which the barons had forced upon him. Louis decided in favor of the royal prerogative.

† The same thing was true to a less extent in the case of the nobles, among whom in general the crusading enthusiasm lingered after it could no longer control the actions of the rulers of Europe. Louis found some difficulty in persuading his nobles to go with him. The story is told that at the king's court one night, before his first crusade, the lights were suddenly extinguished, and when they were relighted, those present were all found to have the cross upon their shoulders.

two crusades of Louis's are the last of the series in the original sense.

It was in the development of government machinery for the great state which the king of France now ruled that the reign of Louis performed its most valuable service to the future nation. On the administrative side, he carried the methods which Philip Augustus had introduced a step farther by the regular employment of officers, called *enquêteurs*, whose duties were like those of the *baillis* on a larger scale. Louis's object was to see that the law was administered and justice done in all parts of his dominion, but these new officers became in truth most efficient agents of centralization, binding all parts of the kingdom to the king, and holding all local officers to a strict responsibility.

Growth of royal institutions.

But the largest growth in Louis's reign was toward a regular system of national courts. If the king's law was to be supreme everywhere, the king's courts must also be supreme in order to enforce it, and there must be more numerous and better organized courts to deal with the increasing business. The original king's court, the *curia regis*, was a kind of public assembly of the king's vassals and great officers, and it performed all kinds of business without distinguishing one kind from another. This had been well enough in primitive times, but with the recent growth of the state it no longer sufficed. The first step in advance was to separate different functions from one another in the business of the court. For a time this remained merely a separation of functions, or more accurately perhaps a classification of business. But gradually there came to be a division of the court itself into separate bodies, each having its own kind of business to attend to. In this way the old *curia regis* divided in Louis's reign—the bodies not becoming

National courts.

The first step.

A classification
of business into
three kinds.

sharply distinguished from one another quite so early perhaps—into three parts, which may almost be called new institutions. There was first the king's council, whose function was to advise the king and to look after administration. Second was the chamber of accounts, whose business was financial, to care for the revenues and to provide for the expenses of the state. Finally there was the body called the "Parlement," which must not be confounded with the English Parliament, for the French Parlement was wholly a judicial body and not at all legislative ; it was the supreme court of France.

Law develops
also.

This process of growth was not limited to the development of courts alone. At the same time there was an equal development of the law to be enforced in the courts. The thirteenth century was especially an age of the study of the law, not alone in France but all over Europe. In many countries lawyers made a careful study of the feudal customary law which they were familiar with in their practice and wrote it down in books for reference. In this age also the study of the Roman law, which had begun a hundred years before in Italy, was becoming general in France.

Two kinds of
law.

Both regard the
king as
supreme.

These two systems of law, feudal and Roman, though they differed on many points, had in common one underlying theory, very differently expressed but the same in effect—the supremacy of the king. In the Roman law the king was the fountain head of all law and justice. His will was law. The feudal law recognized the king as the source of the public functions which the baron exercised. It recognized the right of the baron to his own court, but it regarded this as a delegated right only, held in fief of the king. The inference was alike from either system of law. Under the principles of his own feudal law, the baron would find it hard to deny

the theoretical right of his subject to appeal a case from his court to the king's.

This right of appeal as a practical right Louis took every pains to establish and with success. It is not difficult to understand how much this step would mean in the extension of the king's authority in the still independent baronies. When the king of France asserted his right to entertain appeals from the courts of the duchy of Guienne, which the king of England still held, he was asserting a real right of government over that land. These same principles the king applied in still other directions, in limiting very greatly the right of private war and in forbidding the use of trial by battle in the courts of the royal domain.

How this helped the king.

As the reign of Philip Augustus is the first great epoch in the creation of France geographically, so is that of his grandson, Louis IX., the first in the formation of that strong and absolute government which centered everything in the king.

St. Louis founds the absolute monarchy.

Philip III. was a king of feeble personality who made scarcely any impression upon history himself, but the royal authority went on increasing during his reign as if an impulse had been given it which drove it forward of itself. This seems to have been mainly the work of the king's officers who had been trained in the school of Louis IX., and who continued to work upon the lines which he had laid down and to extend still further the application of the principles which had guided his policy. The death of Philip's uncle, Alphonso, and of his wife without heirs brought in to the domain the great county of Toulouse in the south, and the king prepared the way for further annexations by receiving the homage of the archbishop of Lyons, a city which belonged to the German Empire, and by marrying the heiress of the

Philip III., 1270-1285.

kingdom of Navarre and the county of Champagne to his eldest son, Philip.

Philip IV., the Fair, 1285-1314.

In the reign of that son, Philip IV., the Fair, we can clearly discern the fruits of that absolutist tendency which had now continued without a check for two generations. The government of St. Louis, wise and just and winning the confidence of France, but thoroughly personal and paternal, and that of the royal officers under his son, already beginning to foreshadow its later character of a machine running by strict rule, prepared the way for the iron and tyrannous rule of Philip IV., the first who may be called, in something like the modern sense, an absolute king. The character of the king himself is a matter of doubt, but there is no doubt at all about the character of his reign. It was not the supremacy of justice which was its leading motive, as in that of his grandfather, but the supremacy of law, unfeeling and unvarying law, and the king's will. The king's leading ministers were all lawyers of the new school, thoroughly trained in the Roman law, and the controlling purpose of their lives was to realize in the French monarchy the fundamental principle of that law—the source of all law, of all justice, of all right is the will of the sovereign.

The first absolute king.

Law was the king's instrument.

The national finances.

As the reign of St. Louis is especially distinguished, on the institutional side, by the development of the courts, that of Philip the Fair is by the organization of a national financial system. The revenue of the early Capetians had been confined to the income of the direct domain, the income, it might be called, of the king as a landowner; to the proceeds of fines in the royal courts, no inconsiderable source of revenue in feudal times; and to the occasional payments due from their vassals. For the small kingdom of the early times,

with few expenses in money, with no large corps of salaried officers, with no standing army and no extensive wars, these revenues were sufficient. But now the kingdom had become a great one, numerous officers devoted their lives to its service, and the feudal levies were insufficient for its wars. These changes all meant rapidly increasing expenses, and though the old sources of revenue were pressed to yield their utmost, they could not supply all that was needed, and new methods of raising money were resorted to—the beginnings of modern taxation. Philip made use of indirect taxes upon the merchants' goods, occasional taxes on personal property and incomes, and he required the barons to make payments in money in place of the military service due from them. With this increase of revenue, the machinery for collecting and expending it underwent further organization. Special collectors began to relieve the *prévôts* and *baillis* of this duty, and the treasury department, as we might call it, which had begun to separate from the older *curia regis* in the time of Louis IX., was now completely organized by itself and took its own name—the Chamber of Accounts.

New sources of income.

New collectors.

It was this financial development—specifically the drawing of the clergy into responsibilities for the state's revenue in certain cases—that first led to the great conflict which filled so many years of Philip's reign, and was so eventful in its consequences, the conflict with the pope, Boniface VIII. But if begun over this particular question, it was an inevitable conflict. It would have risen even if there had been no question of the taxation of the clergy. It was at once the sign and the result of the extension of the royal government over all France. The church must be subject to this government as was all the rest of the state. All the Capetian kings had held

Conflict with Pope Boniface VIII.

more or less strictly to this principle, and the later and more powerful kings, like Louis IX. and Philip IV., were not likely to yield any of the prerogatives which their ancestors had exercised. They rather increased them, as in this case of the fiscal responsibility of the clergy.

But the pope who was contemporary with Philip was a man with characteristics like the French king's own, imperious, strong-willed, and entertaining the most exalted ideas of the supremacy of the pope, not merely over the church but over all the powers of the world. It was one of the principles maintained by the church that the clergy should pay nothing to the state if the payment was not sanctioned by the pope. This principle had been already greatly stretched in France in favor of the state, but Boniface now chose to insist upon it, and on Philip's attempt to tax the clergy he issued, in 1296, his famous bull *Clericis laicos*,* which forbade the clergy to pay and the officers of the state to receive such taxes on pain of the excommunication of both. Philip issued soon after, perhaps in answer to this bull, an edict forbidding all exportation of the precious metals from France. This cut off at once all the revenues of the pope from the French Church. Boniface yielded; he issued another bull which explained away the first, and in the following year he canonized Philip's grandfather, Louis IX.

For a little time there was peace between the two, but the course of events in the interval—especially those connected with the great jubilee of the year 1300, to celebrate the centennial of the Christian era, when many thousands from all parts of the Christian world gathered

* The papal bulls are named from their opening words. They are called bulls from the Latin *bulia*, the seal which attested their genuineness.

The pope's
ideas.

He forbids the
clergy to pay
taxes.

at Rome and Boniface had some reason to look upon himself as the head of Christendom—did not tend to diminish the arrogance of the pope, and in 1301 the conflict again began. The occasion was the conduct of a French bishop, Bernard Saisset, who had been appointed papal legate in France. He was a native of Languedoc who hated the king on account of the lost independence of his country, and in conducting his business with the king he made no attempt to control his violent passions. Philip finally had him summoned before a royal court, accused of *lese-majesty*. The pope at once took up the cause of his legate and issued two more bulls, in which he asserted most extravagant claims of the superior right of the pope over all temporal governments. One of them, the bull *Unam sanctam*, contains the famous declaration that it is necessary to believe that every human being is subject to the Roman pontiff.

The second conflict.

In the mean time Philip had taken a step which was of the utmost moment for the future of France. To secure the support of all classes in his resistance to the papal claims he had summoned to attend a meeting of the Great Council of the king not merely the clergy and the nobles, who had often met before, but also representatives of the towns and cities, or of the third estate. The most absolute king that France had had called into existence the Estates General, or legislative assembly, in which the representatives of the people sat with equal right beside the clergy and the nobles. They had as yet but little voice or influence in public affairs, but their mere presence in the assembly was full of promise for the future. Philip himself could hardly have appreciated the danger which he was preparing for his successors, not even when, in 1314, he asked the

Philip summons the nation to council.

The Estates General created.

This corresponds to the English Parliament.

consent of the third estate to a levy of taxes upon the towns. To him it must have seemed rather a most significant proof of his unlimited power that he could thus create a new institution, or at least profoundly modify an old one, and compel the prelates and barons to allow the *bourgeois* so great a place in the public councils. It was a proof also of the unity of France and of the existence of a nation ready to support the king in the defense of its independence.

A proof that the nation has been created.

Philip's appeal to the nation met with the response he desired. The claims of the pope were rejected, and even the French clergy were obliged to yield to the national will. Boniface, however, had no intention of receding from his position, and it was after this meeting of the Estates General that he issued the bull *Unam sanctam*. In the further conflict, the influence of legal ideas at the court of Philip is shown by the adoption of a plan which was destined to have great results in another century, the plan of an appeal to a general council of the church which would have the right, the French lawyers said, to try the pope, as a supreme ecclesiastical court like the king's Great Council, and to determine whether he was legitimately pope or not. It was the service of this appeal upon the pope in person, with the demand that he should abdicate, the shock it caused, the anger and perhaps the fear of actual violence—though the accusation that the king's friends did use blows and physical violence seems to be unfounded—that led to the death of Boniface, then eighty-six years old, in October, 1303. This was the end of the conflict. Boniface's successor was of a yielding disposition, and his short reign was followed by a long succession of French popes, who moved the capital of the ecclesiastical world from Rome to Avignon, where it was sur-

The idea of an appeal to a great council of the church.

rounded by the territory of France, and who followed in almost everything the dictates of the French king—a period of great disorders and abuses in the government of the church, and of decline in the general respect of

The papacy of
Avignon.



SHRINE AT TROVES. A restoration.

Europe for the papacy, known in ecclesiastical history as the "Babylonian captivity."

The great power of Philip was shown quite as clearly in another case—the destruction of the order of the Knights Templar. With the close of the crusades, the order had withdrawn from the Holy Land and settled

The destruction
of the Knights
Templar.

down to the enjoyment of its vast endowments in Europe. Since then, making use of their wide connections, they had been gradually developing a general banking business. It was perhaps the desire to seize upon their vast wealth, in his financial straits, which prompted Philip to act upon the vague accusations of sorcery and horrible crimes which were current among the people and which received some support from their open luxury and the secrecy of their rule. On a single day the Templars throughout France were arrested and thrown into prisons. The trials went as the king desired. The grand master and many others were condemned and burned, and a large part of the riches of the order fell to the king.

The order was
looked upon
with suspicion.

Geographically the growth of France was slight during the reign of Philip. The county of Champagne was added to the domain in right of his wife and for a few years the kingdom of Navarre, and the city of Lyons was seized upon and annexed.

The hereditary struggle with the English Philip took up at the beginning of his reign with much promise of vigor. Advantage was taken of quarrels between the English and Norman sailors to summon King Edward before the king's court at Paris, and when he failed to appear, to declare his fiefs forfeited. But both the kings were too much occupied with other affairs to allow them opportunity to fight to an end upon this question. Philip made use of Scotland against Edward, and so began that long alliance between the two countries which had such important consequences both in their own history and in that of England. Edward found an ally of the same sort in Flanders, and Philip became involved in a long war with that country, whose resources, from the great wealth of its cities, were almost equal to

The war with
England.

France and
Scotland allied.

the king's—a war in which, after the French nobility had been defeated and slaughtered by the burghers in the great battle of Courtrai, he was finally successful and seemed to have added French-speaking Flanders to his domain. But the annexation did not prove a permanent one.

Philip's reign, like St. Louis's, is remarkable for the institutional growth of the state along the lines already begun. The development of the law and of the courts, the introduction of new sources of revenue and the organization of the financial system, the creation of the Estates General, and, perhaps more than all else, the undisguised and constant action of an absolute sovereign—these were the chief lines of progress in his time. To what results such a growth might have led, how much earlier to the appearance of a Louis XIV., with all the state centered in himself, but for the troublous times of the Hundred Years' War with England, which followed so soon and which postponed through a whole century the natural development of the kingdom, it is not possible to say.

Philip's reign
mainly one of
institutional
growth.

It was popularly said in France—perhaps after the event—that the grand master of the Templars in dying at the stake had summoned King Philip to meet him at the bar of God's justice within a year. At any rate, the king's death so soon after the attack upon the Templars seemed a stroke of divine punishment for his acts almost of sacrilege at which France had shuddered; and the deaths of his three sons, which followed one another in rapid succession until the family was extinct, seemed the fulfillment of some curse hanging over his posterity.

France be-
lieved that the
king was
punished.

The reigns of Louis X., Philip V., and Charles IV. together make up but fourteen years. That of Louis X., of two years, was a time of feudal reaction, and of

Three short
reigns,
1314-1328.

charters granted by the king conferring provincial liberties and exemptions whose effects were long felt in France. Philip V., on the contrary, in his reign of six years, represents the tradition of absolutism which was now definitely formed and the policy of his father. It was a reign of great legislative activity and of the development of the new Estates General, and also of vigorous attempts to make the king's money the currency of the nation to the exclusion of that of the feudal lords, and to establish uniform weights and measures. The reign of Charles IV., of equal length, contains no event of importance.

The establishment of the "Salic Law" of succession to the French crown.

This rapid succession of the sons of Philip the Fair had served to establish a rule of succession to the French crown which has been known in history as the "Salic Law," and which was enforced in the most important instance of its application on the death of Charles IV.* When Louis X. died he left a daughter only, but a son was born to him some little time after his death who is sometimes called King John I., though he lived but a few days. This raised the question, which was new in the history of the Capetian dynasty, whether women could succeed to the throne of France or not. If the feudal law of succession to fiefs was to be followed, the right of an heiress must be recognized, and most of the countries of Europe allowed women to reign. France decided otherwise, however, and gave the throne to Louis's brother Philip instead. When Philip died he also left only daughters, and so did Charles IV. in his turn. But he was the last male descendant of Philip

The first break in the direct succession since Hugh Capet.


* In the law code of the early Salian Franks, called the "Salic Law," there was a clause which ran like this: "No inheritance of (Salic) land shall descend to a woman, but all the land shall descend to the male sex." Just what this provision meant, no one knows. But it certainly had no connection with the succession to the throne, and did not mean at all what the term "Salic Law" was made to mean in the later history of France.

IV., and the question of the succession presented itself in a still more difficult form. The nearest heir whose descent was wholly in the male line was Philip of Valois, son of a brother of Philip IV., and therefore first cousin of Charles IV. But Edward III., who had just come to the throne in England, was the son of Charles's sister, Isabella, and therefore nephew of the last king. Edward III. claimed the French crown on the ground that though a woman might be excluded herself, the title could be derived through her by a male heir, and consequently that the throne belonged to him because he was one degree nearer in blood to the last king than Philip of Valois—a claim which was not invalidated by the subsequent birth of Charles the Bad, of Navarre, grandson of Louis X.* This was a principle of succession which had once been generally recognized, but the law was now everywhere turning away from it to the more regular principle of succession in the direct line. Edward's grandfather, Edward I., had decided against it when urged by Robert Bruce as the ground of his claim to the Scottish crown. Edward had his claim presented to the

The claim of Edward III. of England to the French crown.

The same as Bruce's claim to the Scottish crown.

* The succession at the death of Charles IV. and the claim of Edward III. to the French crown:



assembly which was called to decide the question, but the French rejected it, and they could hardly have done otherwise. The intense national feeling of the later France did not then exist, but there was enough of it to render it impossible for the country to accept a foreign king as its sovereign, especially when that king represented also the hereditary enemy of its own royal house.

Great progress
since Hugh
Capet.

The end of the direct succession in the Capetian family is the end also of a natural period in the history of France. It was now three hundred and fifty years since Hugh Capet became king—a long period, but it represented great progress; the virtual creation of France both in area and in institutions. Both had grown steadily forward, as if under some controlling law of growth, uninterrupted either by the weak kings who had occasionally appeared, or by the formation of a great foreign dominion on French soil by the kings of England. The little territory around Paris and Orleans—and that hardly under their real control—with which the first kings had started had now grown into a great kingdom, embracing all France north of the Loire, except the two corners, the eastern and the western, and south of that river a great stretch of territory down to the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean. Flanders, Burgundy, Brittany, and Guienne were the only great fiefs left in France proper which were still independent or even semi-independent. All the rest of France was in the king's hands and directly under his control. The simple machinery which had served all purposes in the little state of Hugh Capet had expanded, also, into a complex system beginning to be clearly differentiated into various departments, legislative, judicial, executive, and financial, and yet all closely centralized in the hands

France almost
completed
geographically,

and Institution-
ally.

of the king. It was not merely a great kingdom which had been formed but also a real government, though it was not yet so perfect as it was to be. In one direction not so much had yet been done toward forming the modern France, largely because the time when it would be possible had not yet come. The intense national feeling, the patriotism of the French people, was still in the future, and yet even here there was a beginning, as we can see in the stand taken by the nation in the contest between Philip IV. and the pope. The groundwork was certainly well laid for the growth of a national consciousness, and the growth itself had begun. All this was the work of these Capetian kings of the direct line. No other reigning family in Europe, not even the great Angevin family in England, had done so much for the country which it ruled.

There was a
beginning even
of a national
feeling.

CHAPTER IX.

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

Philip VI.,
1328-1350.

The Hundred
Years' War.

It was really
a new period in
the old struggle
for the comple-
tion of France.

WITH the accession of Philip of Valois, Philip VI., a very different period opens in the history of France from the one which precedes it. It is known as the Hundred Years' War with England, though it really lasted something more than a century—a period of great suffering and disaster, in which at times the growth of the state was checked and the royal authority seemed about to be destroyed forever, and once at least the nation seemed on the point of actual conquest by the foreigner.

It is not necessary for us to attempt to settle the question whether the blame for beginning this long war rests upon Philip or Edward. It is much more important to recognize the fact that it was an inevitable war. If Louis VI. and Philip Augustus found it necessary to make war upon the English in the interests of France, just beginning to be, much more would a king of France, so nearly completed as it now was, be unable to rest satisfied while such large provinces still remained in foreign hands, and France itself, indeed, would now be able to share the feeling. Nor could any king of England be expected to do otherwise than to defend these provinces most obstinately. Other causes of quarrel were there in abundance: Especially decisive in bringing on the war was the peculiar position of Flanders.

The counts of Flanders held most of their territory as one of the great fiefs of France, and the remainder from

the German Empire. It was the part of northern Europe where manufactures had received the greatest development, and consequently where there were the most numerous and the largest cities, filled with rich burghers, proud of what they had gained and extremely tenacious of their liberties. Such a community was not likely to get along well with a feudal ruler of the old-fashioned sort, and for half a century now there had been almost constant trouble between the citizens and the count. The count naturally looked to his suzerain for aid, and, as naturally, the king of France sympathized with the count and gave him aid when he could against the cities. Philip VI. had opened his reign by winning the victory of Cassel, with terrible slaughter of the burghers, and had restored the count to power.

The part of Flanders in bringing on the war.

On the other hand, in Flanders trade and business considerations were beginning their activity as political forces, and the burghers, by influences of this sort, were closely bound to England. That kingdom stood then in much the same relation to Flanders as that in which our southern states stood to England at the opening of our Civil War. England was the chief source of wool—the most important raw material of the Flemish manufacturers. Without English wool, the looms were idle and the workmen out of employment. Here was a state of things which might at any moment have brought on war between France and England. Commercial reasons, however, could hardly lead to a hundred years' war in that stage of the world's history, and it is doubtful if Edward would ever have taken the steps which he did if he had not become convinced that Philip was determined to deprive him of the remaining English fiefs in southwestern France. The interesting

England necessary to Flanders.

He was accused
of forgery and
sorcery.

story of Robert of Artois's share in bringing on the war may be dismissed to the limbo where modern criticism is sending all the stories of petty causes for great wars. Edward was not the man to be greatly influenced either by the arguments used or by the opportunity offered by a friendless fugitive from French justice even if of the blood royal.

The first move
a matter of
commerce.

In 1336, the count of Flanders, acting for his own interest, as he thought, ordered the arrest of all the English merchants in the country. Edward at once arrested the Flemish in England and stopped the exportation of wool. This very naturally aroused the cities of Flanders, who took matters into their own hands, under the lead of James van Arteveld, and made an arrangement with Edward by which commerce was reopened. The successful attack of Edward's fleet upon the French blockading force on the coast of Flanders was the first open fighting of the war.

Edward's first
invasion of
France.

Edward took advantage of these relations with Flanders to make his first invasion of France through that country. In the summer of 1338, he landed there with his army and found welcome and many professions of friendship from the Flemish burghers, but little real aid. He hired many allies among the German princes of the Rhine Valley, and received the empty title of Imperial Vicar from the emperor, Lewis IV., who was at that time carrying on a bitter conflict with the French pope at Avignon. But he got no help of practical value from any of these sources. His invasion of northeastern France was hardly more than a parade. Philip's advance against him was a mere parade also. Neither seemed to be willing to risk a battle, and Edward returned to England having gained nothing. The only permanent result of the campaign was the title of King

of France, which Edward had formally assumed at the instance of his Flemish allies, in order that, as they said, they might make war upon Philip VI. without committing treason against their suzerain.

Edward calls himself King of France.

Edward's next invasion of France was on the western side, through Brittany, where a civil war had broken out over the succession. Duke John III., who had just died, had left no direct heirs, and the succession was claimed at once by his half brother, John of Montfort, and by his niece Jane. Jane was married to a nephew of King Philip, who declared in this case against the Salic Law by virtue of which he himself held the crown, while Edward took up the cause of John and demanded the exclusion of women. This campaign led to no more important results than the first, and ended like that with a truce between the two kings.

The war in Brittany.

It was only in 1346 that the great war really began, between England and France directly, with the invasion of Normandy by Edward III. One of the chief objects which he had in view in this campaign seems to have been the capture of some port on the French coast which would serve at once as a landing point for any later invasion and as a means of protecting the English commerce of the channel against the French privateers which were a most serious hindrance to it. After some looking about in the west of Normandy where he had landed, he evidently fixed upon Calais as the best situated for his purpose, and began his march for it along the coast. When he reached the Seine he found that the French had destroyed all the bridges to prevent his crossing, and he was obliged to march up the river nearly to Paris before he succeeded in getting across. Then he turned directly for Calais, but Philip pursued him with a great army, and at Crécy Edward determined to fight.

Edward invades Normandy.

The English
have the better
army,

and the long
bow.

The battle of
Crécy.

Over 30,000 are
said to have
perished.

The famous battle of Crécy illustrates well the great difference between the English and the French armies which was of such vital importance through the whole of this war. The English army was small and composed for the larger part of footmen, but they were men highly trained, confident in their own skill and ability, and armed with the terrible national weapon, the long bow, whose effects as recorded in contemporary accounts we can hardly credit. The French was a feudal army, large, loosely organized, and hardly under control, and filled with contempt for an army of foot soldiers, who must be peasants they thought—a contempt which their recent victory at Cassel over the Flemings had done something to increase, if not to justify. One reason why France suffered so many defeats in this war was because she was fighting in the old feudal style against more modern tactics and against a weapon almost as effective as the modern musket.

As the French army came in sight of the small English force posted on the little hill at Crécy, they must have felt only contempt for it, for Edward had made his horsemen dismount, so that it must have seemed to the French a force of foot soldiers only. They probably felt sure that they could sweep it off the field with a single charge, but they hardly got within striking distance. Their defeat was complete and the slaughter great, though probably the numbers which are given us are exaggerated. This victory cleared the way for the long siege of Calais, which Edward finally captured, and which remained for a little more than two hundred years an English port, of the greatest value to English commerce.

This was the end of the war so far as Philip was concerned, for he died in 1350 and was succeeded by his

son John. One stroke of better fortune in the reign of Philip must be mentioned. The dauphin of Vienne, whose lands were a part of the old kingdom of Burgundy or Arles, and therefore belonged really to the German Empire, being without heirs of his own, sold his territories to the king of France on condition that they should always be regarded as a provision for the kings' eldest sons in succession. From this time to the Revolution the heir to the French crown bore the title of Dauphin.

John II.,
1350-1364.

Why the crown
prince of France
was called the
Dauphin.

King John is known in French history as John the Good, but this title does not mean "the good king," but rather, as it has been expressed, "the good fellow." He was prodigal and careless, but his worst fault was one that he shared with his father, he was thoroughly a feudal king—more feudal, they have been called, than the first Capetians—or to put it more accurately, perhaps, he was too completely a product of his own time, the time when chivalry was flourishing upon the decay of feudalism. A king of this sort, even if he may have suffered some injustice from historians who have not understood him, was not the man to lead France wisely through the difficulties which surrounded her. He rather increased them, even with the best of intentions.

John a bad
king for this
crisis.



JOHN THE GOOD.

In connection with the reign of John, we think first of all, and very naturally, of the great victory of Poitiers which the Black Prince won in the center of France, in 1356, over a vastly larger French army—an even more

Battle of
Poitiers.

complete victory than that of Crécy, in which King John was taken prisoner, to spend the most of his remaining years in London. But this victory, brilliant as it was, was by no means the most important fact of John's reign. These great English successes, at Crécy and Poitiers, were of but little permanent value to them. They were no nearer to the conquest of France than before. Every hilltop had its fortified castle, and by far the larger part of the war was occupied with the siege of one of these places after another, and the capture of any one gave possession of only a square mile or two. This feature of the war is strikingly evident in the chronicles of Froissart. The conquest of a country, such as France then was, by an invading army provided with no better siege appliances than the time afforded, was a practical impossibility. The English might gain such victories as these whenever the French would fight them in the open field, but it was not conquest.

These interesting chronicles can be read in English.

The suffering in France.

It is easy to realize what France suffered from such campaigns. Almost every part of it, at one time or another, was the scene of an English invasion. An English army, which could not hope to hold the country, made it its business to leave a desert behind it. Everything in the open country which could be reached was destroyed, villages were burned and immense quantities of plunder carried off to England. So great was the desolation created by these and related causes that some of the later English armies found themselves in danger of starving. In the intervals between the foreign attacks, civil war raged almost incessantly, either between great parties in the state or on account of the local feuds of the nobles, for private war revived again in this period of disaster as if it had never been checked. France was still mainly a feudal country, that is, a coun-

A relapse into feudal anarchy.

try of fragments, for though the kings had succeeded in uniting nearly all of it under a single rule, time enough had not yet elapsed for the old lines of division to disappear and a real unity of feeling to grow up. The last period of this war was to do much to create such a unity, but in the beginning France easily fell apart again when the central government was weak or embarrassed, and the old jealousies and strifes awoke.

Two other causes of disorder peculiar to the war added not a little to the suffering. One was the "great companies," or "free companies," as they were called, bands of mercenary troops, the first beginnings of regular paid armies, who in the intervals of peace were thrown out of employment and took to plundering and ravaging the land on their own account, even putting strong cities to ransom. The other was the insurrections of the peasants in parts of France. They were, of course, more directly exposed to the ravages of war than any other class, and sometimes in mere despair they seized upon any arms they could find and followed the example of plunder and destruction set them on every side. The greatest and most famous of these insurrections, the Jacquerie, in northeastern France, seems to have had scarcely any reasonable purpose. It was a blind raging of wild beasts bent on vengeance and on making the upper classes feel something of the miseries which they had had to endure. But it was easily put down. The English nobles joined the French against it in the cause of their class.

Soldiers out of employment,

and revolted peasants added to the disorder.

The Jacquerie, 1358.

Add to these causes of suffering the pestilence called the Black Death which swept over Europe in the reign of Philip VI., visiting all countries impartially with its fearful destruction of life, carrying off in some places nearly or quite one half of the population, and one may


The Black Death.

begin to understand how in many parts of France the country fell back into wilderness, how grass grew in the streets of Paris, and wolves howled in its suburbs.

The beginning
of a consti-
tutional change

The most permanent effect of this period of the war upon the future of France was the retarding of its economic development through this great destruction of life and property. But certain events in the reigns of Philip

and John are of peculiar interest for the promise which they gave of a complete change in the constitutional development of the country, and from the fact that they are without a parallel in any other part of French history.



NOBLES UNDER JOHN THE GOOD.

The necessities of the war placed of course a great financial burden upon the French government. It was entirely unable to meet

it with the ordinary resources of the state. Income must in some way be increased. It was important to the government that the new taxes should not merely be imposed but paid, and the best way to secure this result seemed to be to obtain in advance the consent of those upon whom the taxes would fall. To get this consent appeal was made to the institution which Philip IV.

in the financial
necessities of
the govern-
ment.

had created and Philip V. developed—the Estates General. Frequent meetings of the Estates were held for this purpose, sometimes of the whole kingdom, but more often of the separate provinces, or of larger parts of the country. But these assemblies seemed strangely indifferent to the financial needs of the king, and far more interested in the numerous abuses which prevailed in the state, and they occupied themselves in demanding reforms and changes in the methods of government, as conditions of grants of taxes, as if they were holding meetings of the English Parliament and engaged in making the English constitution:

This process had begun in the reign of Philip VI., but it reached its climax in the reign of John, just before and just after the battle of Poitiers. The Estates General of 1355 demanded that the tax which they voted should be collected and paid out by officers responsible to them alone, and that they should meet in the following year to control the collection and to examine the accounts. They demanded further that the army should be organized and paid by their representatives, that the currency should be reformed, and that the people should have the right of resisting with force even the royal officers, if they attempted any unauthorized acts. After the battle of Poitiers the assemblies became still more revolutionary, and the people of Paris, under the lead of the provost of the merchants, Etienne Marcel, took a leading part in the movement. The demands of these assemblies, which were accepted by the dauphin, who was now acting for his father, were embodied in the "Great Ordinance" of 1357. By this ordinance, a tax was granted upon all orders for a year, to be collected and expended under the direction of the Estates. The Estates were to meet three times a year, even without

Reforms demanded by the Estates General.

Etienne Marcel.

the royal summons ; the king's council was to be reënforced by members of the assembly ; the royal domain was to be restored to its condition under Philip IV., and further alienations were forbidden ; the law courts were to be reformed and justice better administered ; private war was to be suppressed and all classes allowed to bear arms ; and no changes were to be made in the currency without the approval of the Estates.

Reaction
against the
Estates.

This ordinance represents the highest point of success reached by this movement. The frequent meetings of the Estates undermined the public respect for them, and their alliance with the Parisian populace, an even more revolutionary element than themselves, and showing even at this early date many of the characteristic features of later Parisian mobs, with their revolutionary caps and their street barricades, still further reduced their influence as a national body. The movement fell into the hands of Marcel and of Charles the Bad of Navarre, the grandson of Louis X., and allied itself with the revolted peasants, and even stood ready to sell the country to the English to gain their support. Marcel was finally killed, and the dauphin Charles was able to regain possession of the capital.

The treaty of
Brétigny, 1360.

But Edward III. was now ready for peace. He had gained no important success since the battle of Poitiers, and if he could obtain secure possession of the old English lands, he stood ready to yield his claims on the rest of France. After long negotiations the treaty of Brétigny was concluded, which was to be a permanent peace between the two countries. Edward gave up his claim to the French crown, and received in full sovereignty, no longer under any feudal dependence upon the king of France, nearly the whole of the old inheritance of Eleanor, including Poitou and lands that had

now long been French. King John was to be released from captivity, and his ransom was fixed at three million crowns payable within six years. It was in reality hopeless for France to try to raise such a sum of money, and finally, on the escape of one of his sons, who was held as a hostage for the payment by the English, King John, in the true spirit of chivalry, of which he thought so much, returned to London, where he died in 1364.

It has been thought by some that he preferred London to Paris.

The English would have been very glad to consider the treaty of Brétigny a permanent arrangement, but King Charles was an entirely different kind of man from his father, and for him it was only a breathing space during which France might recruit her energies for a final effort to expel her enemies.

A new kind of king.

King Charles V. is known in history as Charles the Wise, and the title is as deserved as such titles ever are. He was not a great soldier or a knight



Charles V.,
1364-1380.

CHARLES V.

like his father, but he was a diplomatist, dispassionate and skillful, a good judge of men to carry out his plans, and of times when they should be attempted. The great object of his life was to restore France to its old position, and in this he was in large measure success-

Bertrand du
Guesclin.

ful. Bertrand du Guesclin, his most trusted commander, is popularly better known than the king. Of the minor Breton nobility, poor and misshapen, he attracted the attention of the king by his military talents and was raised to high commands, usually held only by the great nobles, but his successes fully justified the king's confidence.

The Black
Prince becomes
involved in
Spain.

In the interval of peace after the treaty of Brétigny, civil wars in the kingdom of Castile came to the aid of King Charles. They enabled him to get rid of the "great companies" whose presence was so injurious to the country, and they involved Edward the Black Prince, who took up the cause of Peter the Cruel, in exhausting military expeditions which led to no good results, but which compelled him to lay heavy taxes upon his French subjects. As soon as Charles believed that he was prepared for war, he began to listen to the complaints which Edward's Aquitanian vassals were sending to Paris against his demands for money. He summoned Edward before the court of peers, and Edward answered that he would go, but with his helmet on his head and sixty thousand men at his back.

Discontent in
Aquitaine.

New French
tactics.

In the war that followed, the French adopted new tactics against their enemies. They refused to allow the English the advantage which they seemed always to have in pitched battles, but let them exhaust themselves in expeditions which accomplished nothing, while they watched their march closely and cut off all stragglers, made sudden attacks when opportunity favored, and reduced one strong place after another, often with the aid of the local lords or of the inhabitants. Edward the Black Prince, worn out with disease and disappointment, soon went home to die, after his useless and unworthy massacre of the people of Limoges. Edward III. was in

his dotage, no longer able to direct the war. King Charles would grant only short truces, as suited his purpose, and before he died the English possessions were reduced to a few strong towns along the coast and the territory which these commanded.

The English almost expelled from all France.

In the internal government of the country, Charles V. was as wise and as successful, at least in the interests of the royal power, as in the war with England. He knew from his early experiences the danger to the king's authority which the Estates General presented, and he called them together only when necessity demanded and then he held them well under control. The great work of his reign was in the development of a national system of taxation and in the organization of the army. He brought the public finances into order once more, regulated the system of collection and accounts, fixed the forms of taxation and introduced new kinds of taxes, and, most important of all for the future, he acted upon the principle that a single grant of a tax conveyed a perpetual right of collecting it, and so prepared the way for the independence of the king, in the matter of taxation, of all control by the national legislature.

Charles also advances the royal power.

He takes the first step toward arbitrary taxation.


In the military organization, the old feudal force almost entirely disappeared, it did disappear completely as a main reliance for the public defense. For a long time past, from even before the beginning of the Hundred Years' War, the practice had been coming into use of paying the nobles for their military services, and now this became the fixed rule. The noble was paid for all that he did, for garrisoning and repairing his own castle even, and for defending his own lands. But this, of course, necessarily implied the denial of the foundation principle of the feudal system—fiefs and privileges as payments for services to the state—and

The military system reformed,

so as to destroy the military value of the feudal system.

**Destruction of
feudal castles.**

it was also a recognition on the part of the baron who accepted the new kind of payment of the full right of the king to command. On this principle Charles ordered the destruction of a large number of castles which contributed nothing to the defense of the king-



THE CORONATION OF CHARLES V.

**A standing
army.**

dom. The nobles who served in the field appeared there no longer as feudal lords at the head of their retainers, but they were organized into companies under the command of royal officers who might be nobles of very inferior rank. At the same time and independently of these companies, the standing army began in the introduction of regular bodies of paid troops,

officered by the king and entirely under his control. The military revolution was made still more complete by the introduction of gunpowder, which made its first appearance near the beginning of this war, and came into regular use during its course.

Thus, in the midst of this great war, so full of unparalleled disasters for France, after the reigns of two feudal kings and the apparent dismemberment of the kingdom, came the reign of a sovereign who almost expelled the English from France, and who advanced the power of the royal government almost more than any of his predecessors, or at least prepared the way for such an advance, who established principles which would free the king from financial dependence upon the Estates General, and thus deprived the nation of the most effective weapon which it could use in the formation of a constitutional government, and who took from the barons their only useful service to the state, deprived the feudal system of all reason for being, and gave to the king the entirely independent control of an army of his own. His reign is of even more importance than this in the history of the growth of the French nation. For it came after forty years of disaster, and just before another forty years of still greater disaster and anarchy. It gave France a generation of recovery, and it strengthened the hold of the king's absolute government on the habits and ideas of the nation in the middle of a long period which threatened to destroy it. Charles V. is not so picturesque a figure in history as the great kings of chivalry, John, or Edward, or the Black Prince. But he was a far more useful sovereign of his country.

The great services of Charles V. in development of France.

The next reign was in marked contrast to that of Charles the Wise. It was another period of great national disasters, due in this case, however, to civil

Charles VI.,
1380-1422.

The dukes of
Burgundy.

strife rather than to foreign invasion. Charles VI. was only eleven years old at his father's death and the government fell into the hands of his uncles, the *Sires de la Fleur de Lis*, or Princes of the Lilies, as they were called, men utterly selfish, ready to sacrifice the interests of the crown or of the nation to gain their personal ends. The principal one of these was Philip, duke of Bur-



THE LOUVRE UNDER CHARLES V.

A new state
forming on the
east of France.

gundy. When the old line of the dukes of Burgundy died out, in the reign of John, instead of following the hereditary Capetian policy and adding that great duchy to the domain of the crown, that king, as a genuine feudal king, had reëstablished that fief in favor of his son Philip. The probable speedy extinction of a number of the great baronial or princely families in the Low Countries had suggested to the ambition of Philip the union of these lands under his rule—possibly he foresaw the dream which his descendants cherished of a restoration of the old kingdom of Lothaire between France and Germany. He had himself married the daughter and heiress of the count of Flanders—"the richest land in Christendom"—and was steadily directing his policy to

the enlargement of his power in that direction. Just now the cities of Flanders were in successful revolt against the rule of the count under the lead of Philip van Arteveld, the son of James. To put down this insurrection, the duke of Burgundy made use of his influence over the king, and it was with a royal army that the great victory of Roosebek was gained, in which thousands of Flemings and their leader, Philip van Arteveld, were slain. This victory also put an end to the popular movement in Paris and some other French cities, which had begun in resistance to the heavy taxation of the time, and to which the princes had been temporarily forced to yield.

Defeat of the
Flemings.

When Charles VI. reached the age of twenty he dismissed his uncles and took the government into his own hands. For a few years there was great hope of good government. The king restored to power the ministers of his father and gave them free hand for legislation and reform. But Charles's mind had never been strong and his health was declining. Finally, in 1392, on a long march in the heat of summer, he was suddenly seized with violent insanity and killed four of his attendants before he could be mastered. From this time forward he had only occasional lucid intervals, growing shorter and less frequent as he grew older. His uncles at once returned to power, and the king was always used as a puppet by some one to the end of his life.

Early govern-
ment of Charles
VI.

The king be-
comes insane.

The king's brother, the young duke of Orleans, now came into prominence as the chief rival of the duke of Burgundy. He was a brilliant prince, but probably as selfish as his uncle. Gradually France divided itself into two parties under their lead: that of the duke of Burgundy, who had now become count of Flanders and made peace with the Flemish cities, represented a more

Two hostile
parties formed.

popular element, the people of the towns, while that of Orleans was the aristocratic party.

In 1404, Duke Philip died and was succeeded in his plans and ambitions by his son John the Fearless. The young duke found himself less able than his father to bear with patience the rivalry of his cousin, and the duke of Orleans was murdered in Paris while on his way to call on the king. His death did not, however, destroy his party. It found new leaders and was frequently called from now on the party of the Armagnacs, from one of these leaders, the count of Armagnac, whose daughter was married to the new duke of Orleans, the son of the murdered duke. Duke John of Burgundy, who boldly acknowledged his responsibility for the murder, was in possession of Paris, and the Armagnacs could not

Murder of the
duke of Orleans,
1407.

The Armag-
nacs.



A NOBLE LADY.
Costume of the end of the fourteenth century.

dislodge him. The artisans of Paris were strongly on his side, and the city fell under a new mob rule, that of the Butchers it is called, or of the Cabochians, from the name of one of its leaders, Caboché. There were better elements in the party, however. The University of Paris—which was just at that time taking a leading part in settling the great question which was agitating the Christian world of how to reunite the church, divided in the Great Schism between the pope who ruled at Rome and the pope who ruled at Avignon—the university was on the side of the people. At a meeting of the Estates General in 1413, the ordinance known as the Cabochian Ordinance was adopted, decreeing a long list of reforms relating mostly to the national offices and revenue. But it was rescinded within a few weeks. A sudden reversal of popular feeling, so common in the history of France, restored the Armagnacs to power and undid all the work of the Burgundian party. This was the situation—civil war between two great parties in France—when the English invasions were renewed.

The rule of the Cabochians, or Butchers.

Attempts at reform.

During all the reign of Charles VI. up to this time the war with England had continued in form but with no real results for either side. There had been an alternation of truces and of declarations of war, with threats of invasions and of great deeds, but both countries had been too fully occupied with their domestic troubles to be able to take up any foreign war with vigor. The strength of France had been spent in civil conflicts. In England, at the end of the fourteenth century, a revolution had dethroned Richard II. and made king in his place the Lancastrian Henry IV. Henry had had too much to do in strengthening his hold upon the crown to undertake a serious invasion of France, and later when

An intermittent war with England.

Henry V. of
England.

See Church's
"Henry V."

France divided.

Battle of Agin-
court, 1415.

Murder of the
duke of Bur-
gundy.

he felt more secure he had been deterred by his own ill health. But now the young Henry V. had come to the throne with a united England behind him and full of ambition. Whatever we may think of the motive which led Edward III. to assume the title of King of France, there can be no question but that Henry was led to do so chiefly by ambition and the desire for conquest.

It was certainly a favorable moment. The burden of defending the kingdom might be expected to fall upon the Armagnacs, who had possession of the capital and the king, while it might be hoped that the Burgundians would stand aloof and watch the result. So at least it turned out. Henry landed in the west of Normandy and repeated almost exactly the campaign of Edward III. which led to the battle of Crécy. Agincourt was another battle of the same sort, in which a great army of the French chivalry was defeated and slaughtered by a little English force. The loss fell chiefly on the Armagnacs, but they were still strong enough to retain possession of Paris and of the king, though the duke of Burgundy strove to drive them out. After the battle, the English began the slow process of capturing the fortified places of northern France to make their occupation complete, and, thanks to King Henry's interest in the improvement of siege cannon, they were steadily successful. In 1418, treason gave to Duke John possession of Paris and of the person of King Charles. The queen had joined him some time before, but the dauphin was with the Orleanists and firmly opposed to the Burgundians. In the following year, the duke was persuaded to an interview with the dauphin on a bridge at Montrebeau and murdered at his feet.

This murder was the turning point in this period of French history. For years it seemed to have been the

death of French independence as well as of the duke of Burgundy. The new duke immediately entered into an alliance with the English, in which the king and queen of France were joined. The treaty of Troyes was signed between them. It provided that Charles VI. should be recognized by Henry as king as long as he lived, but that on his death Henry should become king of France, and the two kingdoms have henceforth one king. As soon as the treaty was concluded Henry married the princess Katherine, daughter of Charles VI.

The Burgundians join the English.

Treaty of Troyes, May, 1420.

Henry V. never became king of France, however. He died a few weeks before the death of Charles, leaving his son Henry less than a year old. When Charles died Henry VI. was recognized by the Burgundian party as king of France. The dauphin Charles was with the Orleanists still, and had as yet given no evidence of his ability to rule. He had in his possession only the territory south of the Loire, and not the southwestern portion of that, while all the rest of France was in the hands of the English and the Burgundians. The regency of France was offered by the English to the duke of Burgundy but refused, and the little king's uncle, John, duke of Bedford, became regent, while another uncle, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, the evil genius of England in this crisis of her history, was made protector of England during the absence of the duke of Bedford. Bedford was a man of very unusual political skill, and if abilities could have done it, he might have maintained the English rule in France. But the tide was now on the point of turning and all things were to work against this unnatural conquest.

Charles VII., 1422-1461.

The duke of Bedford regent for Henry VI.

This did not seem to be the case at first, however. The English continued to advance and soon laid siege to the city of Orleans on the Loire, which was the key

Siege of Orleans.

to the territory still held by the dauphin. If Orleans fell, apparently nothing could hold back the English from the conquest of all France. And the fall of Orleans seemed certain. Attempts to relieve it had not

been successful. The besiegers had drawn a line of fortifications around the city to make the blockade complete. An attempt made by the French to cut off a great supply train coming to the English, loaded chiefly with dried herrings, had been a complete failure and had "added ridicule to the misfortune of France." So hopeless seemed the future that the dauphin and his friends were discussing the plan of abandoning France to its fate for the present, and taking refuge in Scotland or in Spain. Then it was that the tide turned. "It was one of those points where history has approached most nearly to the miraculous." If not miraculously moved herself, the results which Joan of Arc accomplished certainly seem miraculous.



A CANNON OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

The "Day of
the Herrings,"
1429.

Joan of Arc.

Born in a village on the eastern edge of France near the borders of Burgundy, of a family of well-to-do farmers, Joan had passed her childhood where she saw much of the civil strife which was the curse of France, and was made to realize from constantly recurring scenes around her the sufferings of the whole country. Of a deeply religious nature and with a firm confidence in the goodness of God, she came to believe that it must be his will that these sufferings should cease, and finally that she was herself divinely called to bring them to an end. With her impressionable nature, she no doubt heard, as plainly as she heard the bells of the churches,

the voices which called her to this duty. It was with much difficulty, however, that she persuaded others of her mission. But at last she succeeded. Admitted to the presence of the dauphin, she convinced him of her supernatural knowledge, and though his favorite, La Trémouille, put every possible obstacle in her way, she overcame them all.

It was this which France was waiting for, leadership ; something which would restore confidence and merely start the current of success. The popular feeling was already prepared for it. Many signs had been seen of late that the inhabitants of those parts of France which the English held were ready to strike for deliverance. It was the beginning of a truly national feeling, of patriotism, of the consciousness that all France was one, and that the Frenchman could not submit to any foreign dominion. The birth of a genuine national feeling was a greater achievement in the making of the French nation than any which the Capetian kings had yet accomplished, but it was their work, the bringing of the fragments together under a single government, which had rendered it possible, and it was the effort of their most dangerous foe to undo this work, and to restore the old condition of disunion, which called forth the first strong outburst of this which is henceforth the deepest of all French feelings, the love of the nation and pride in its achievements. And this it was which gave to Joan the success which she gained, the new feeling of confidence, and determination, and enthusiasm which her leadership aroused, the belief that God was once more on their side. It was not her military skill, for she displayed none. She simply led, and France freed herself.

Joan first advanced against Orleans, and the English were instantly driven from their strong position. She

She gives leadership to the nation.

France is now a nation, in feeling as well as in territory.

Joan's success.

then set out on what she declared to be her special mission, to lead the dauphin to Rheims to be crowned, and though the task seemed to be impossible, she accomplished it without a check. On the 6th of March, 1429, she had first appeared at the dauphin's court, on the 17th of July he was crowned in Rheims as King Charles VII. Joan's mission was now accomplished, and she seemed to be conscious of the fact herself, but for some reason she still remained with the army, though she gained no more successes. In May, 1430, she was taken prisoner by the Burgundians, and by them sold to the English.

Captured by
the English.

To whom is to be assigned the heaviest guilt for the death of Joan will perhaps never be determined. The English, certainly, must bear a large share of it, for whether they urged on her trial or not, they certainly could have prevented it. But Charles must share the blame with them, since it is now evident that he could have freed her by exchange if he had really desired to do so. Her execution was certainly a great blunder on the part of the English. Their best policy would have been to have sent her back to the French as a free gift if they could not exchange her. Her work was really over and she could have won no further success. They did what was needed to restore her leadership ; for the words which legend puts into the mouth of an English soldier, "We have burned a saint," were at least prophetic of the future fact. They had burned a peasant girl whose work was done, but they had made for the new French nation a martyr and a saint.

Her execution

a great mis-
take.

Continued suc-
cess of the
French.

From this time on the progress of the French arms was constant though it was slow. It was a war of sieges rather than of battles—the new French policy was to refuse all battles unless upon their own terms—and

it was interrupted now and again by truces with the English. But it was on the whole a steady advance under excellent leadership. In more than one important city the burghers rose upon the English garrison and compelled them to surrender when the French appeared. In 1431, the duke of Bedford died, and henceforth the English were ruled by divided councils, ending in bitter party strife, the immediate forerunner of the War of the Roses.

In 1435, the treaty of Arras was concluded with the duke of Burgundy, by which he returned to the French side, though he set his price high—the cession of many cities in the valley of the Somme, and the full sovereignty of his territories during his lifetime. In 1436, Paris was recovered. In 1449, Rouen was taken, and in the next year all Normandy freed. In 1451, Guienne was attacked and occupied with rapid successes, Bordeaux even surrendering at the end of June. But this part of the southwest had never been French before. It had been in the hands of the English for three hundred years, and it was bound to England by many ties, especially by its commercial relations, which Bordeaux found, as it thought, more profitable than it could under French rule. For this reason Talbot was able, in 1452, quickly to recover Bordeaux and almost all Guienne. But in the battle of Castillon in the next year Talbot was killed and that was the end. Of all their former possessions in France only Calais remained to the English. France was united once more under a king of her own, in fact she was more truly France than she had ever been before, both in the control of all her territory and, most important of all, in her national feeling.

The duke of Burgundy abandons the English.

Only Calais is left to the English.

Charles VII. is known in history both as the Vic-

Charles VII.
restores the
royal power.

torious and the Well-served, and, whether the credit is due to the king's ministers or, as seems probable, to the king himself, the reign, after the virtual close of the war, was one of recovery and restoration both of the resources of the country and of the royal power. In this last particular Charles followed closely in the path marked out by his grandfather, Charles the Wise. The



CHARLES VII.

princes of the blood, who had given so much trouble in the past half century, and who occupied, by the hold which they had on the provinces assigned them as appanages, almost the position of the old great feudal barons, were taught that they must submit to the king. They were ready to resist even to the point of renewed civil war

while the English were still in France, but their insurrection in 1440, called the *Praguerie*, though supported by the dauphin Louis, was soon put down.

A royal army.

In the reorganization of the government, the greatest work of Charles was the establishment of a standing army and of a permanent system of taxation. This work was begun by the "Great Ordinance" adopted by the Estates General at Orleans in 1439. This put the levy of all military forces in the hands of the king and

forbade all others, lords or captains of free companies, to raise troops or to command them without the king's commission. To sustain the standing army of the king, the same ordinance established a permanent tax on the land, the *taille*, at least the king interpreted this as a permanent tax and so explained it to all objectors when he continued to levy it without any further grant. This was really an act of abdication on the part of the Estates General, and the kings were not slow to see it in that light, and they all followed the example of Charles. Though Charles VII. had summoned meetings of the Estates several times before 1439, he did so only once after that date to the end of his reign in 1461, and his son, Louis XI., also called them together only once in twenty-two years. This act had one further effect. The nobles, not cultivating the land themselves, were exempt from the payment of this tax, and, for this slight exemption, they allowed themselves to be reconciled to the cessation of the meetings of the national legislature. Thus a distinction was drawn in France, which time still further widened, between the interests of the nobles and those of the people, and an alliance of these two classes to limit the power of the king and to build up that of the legislature in which both could find a stage for public action, the alliance which created the English constitution, was rendered impossible in France. The king, who had already drawn into his hands the chief functions of the state, became steadily more and more absolute, because the only classes in the state capable of organizing opposition to his power had no interest to do so.

Royal
taxation.

The Estates
General practically
suspended.

No opposition
to the crown in
France, like
that which
existed in
England.

CHAPTER X.

FRANCE BEGINS TO BE A EUROPEAN POWER.

Louis XI.,
1461-1483.

France, united
at home, can
extend her
power abroad.

WITH the reign of Louis XI., we enter upon a new era in the history of France. This is the case, not merely because the Hundred Years' War was now over and all French territory now independent, but because, in the main, the work of forming France was also over. The feudal states, which divided her territory and defied her king when Hugh Capet came to the throne, had now disappeared, and in their place was the one sovereign who was acknowledged by all as the ruler of France. The problems of government, too, at which the Capetians had been working at the same time, were nearly solved, so nearly, at least, that there was no rival power which shared with the king the government of the state. Neither church, nor nobles, nor legislature had any standing ground from which to dispute the king's will, and, if the entire machinery of an absolute government was not yet in working order, it was only a question of time when it would be so. With these domestic problems, which had so long tasked the energies of the rulers of France, so nearly solved, attention was at once attracted to questions of foreign politics, and France began that career of European influence and of conquests at the expense of other states, around which her history in modern times mainly centers. The same thing was also true, in a general way, of most of the other states of Europe at this time. They were settling into some kind of permanent order at home—either the triumph of cen-

tralization as in Spain, or of separation as in Germany and Italy, or of self-government with a strong central power as in England—and they were all beginning to be more or less interested in the extension of their influence abroad. Of course these interests came into collision with one another, and the age upon which we are now entering is an age of international rivalries, of diplomacy and wars, as the last had been of struggles within the national limits. It is hardly necessary to say that this must not be understood to mean the absolute beginning of international politics. Something of the sort had always existed, and as we approach the middle of the fifteenth century it becomes more and more a leading interest. Especially is the reign of Charles VII., in the activity of its foreign relations, a foreshadowing of the future. But from this time on, with the exception of the interval of the Huguenot civil wars, foreign interests are the leading interests, the struggle for supremacy in Europe the chief issue, in the political history of France.

Other states do the same,

and modern international politics arise.

One great difficulty, which may be called half domestic and half foreign, still remained to be overcome—a difficulty so great as to be a serious danger, the threatening position occupied by the duke of Burgundy. This was a domestic difficulty, because the duke of Burgundy was a prince of the French royal family and on account of his great resources the head of those royal princes who, from the system of assigning to them the feudal provinces as appanages, had almost reconstructed the old feudal system. It was a foreign question, partly because in addition to his French fiefs, like Burgundy and Flanders, the duke had also many fiefs of the German Empire, like the counties of Burgundy and Holland and the duchy of Brabant; but it was a foreign difficulty

The difficulty created by Burgundy.

It was forming
a new state.

chiefly because a new and very rich state was forming on the northeast borders of France, so strong that France must soon lose all control over it, and with it lose some of her finest provinces. It was this ambition, to form an

independent state with the title of king, which Charles the Bold, the constant enemy of Louis XI., made the great object of his policy, and this danger was serious enough, both in itself and in the difficulties which Charles was constantly creating for Louis in France, to occupy the king's hands for almost the whole of his reign.

The place which has been given to Louis in literature and in legend has



A CHATELAINE.

Costume of the middle of the fifteenth century.

Charles the
Bold.

Character of
Louis XI.

made his personal character better known to us than that of most kings so far behind us in history. His character excited great interest in his own times, as well as in later times, partly because it stood in such marked contrast to that of the kings of feudalism and chivalry—it was a new type of kingship—and partly because the favorite weapons which he used, dissimulation and underhanded diplomacy, aroused the fears, while

their success tempted the admiration, of every one. His moral standard was expressed in his phrase: "He who has success has honor," and though he was brave enough on the battle-field when he was forced to fight, his favorite method of overcoming his enemies was to yield for the moment to their demands and as soon as an opportunity offered, to take them at a disadvantage, refuse to keep his promises, break his oaths, and recover all that he had given them. The extent and activity of his foreign diplomacy, although it was almost all defensive, directed against the plans of Charles the Bold, mark him as a king of the new era, and in some instances, as in Italy, he pointed out the way of future policy for his successors whose hands were more free.

As dauphin, Louis had been on very unfriendly terms with his father, and his accession raised hopes in the minds of the princes of the blood that the policy of Charles VII. would be reversed. They very speedily learned their mistake. Louis did allow himself to turn out of office all his father's ministers, but he at once asserted the rights of the king wherever they came in question. His first important act was to demand the privilege which the treaty of Arras had reserved to the king, and to buy back, for a sum paid down, the cities on the Somme which had been ceded by that treaty to the duke of Burgundy. This act set into active opposition the young Charles the Bold, not yet duke, and a league, which called itself the League of the Public Weal, was formed embracing almost every prince of the blood and enemy of the royal power in France, with Louis's brother, the duke of Berry, as its nominal head, but with Charles the Bold as its real leader. Louis had to fight one battle to open his way into Paris, and then he negotiated. He seemed to yield everything that was

Louis insists upon the supremacy of the king.

The League of the Public Weal.

Louis yields
only to gain
time.

asked of him. His brother was given Normandy. The cities on the Somme and other territories were given to Burgundy. Even the lesser rebels received offices and pensions. But Louis had yielded only that he might break up the league, and separate his enemies. Within three months he had recovered Normandy, while Charles was occupied with an insurrection in his own lands which kept him from interfering with Louis's plans.

Louis and
Charles at
Péronne.

Louis overreached himself a little later, when he went to meet Charles in Péronne, thinking that his superior skill in diplomacy would win him an easy victory. Possibly it might have done so if Charles had not been convinced that another insurrection, which broke out in Liège, was due to Louis's machinations. The king was in serious danger for a moment, and was again obliged to yield to the demands of Charles, but with no more honesty of purpose than in the first case. As soon as Louis could venture to do so he annulled the treaty without fulfilling its conditions. Charles in anger declared war and invaded France but met with no great success, and, as he became interested in plans looking to the east and south, he gave up the attempt. He succeeded, however, in inducing the king of England, Edward IV., the first Yorkist king, whose sister Charles had married, to renew the English invasions. Louis met the invasion with his usual weapon, diplomacy, and bought off the English king, who, indeed, had enough to do at home. Charles was never able to take up the war again. Things were now going badly with him. His negotiations with the emperor, Frederick III., for the title of king, failed, and he suffered three severe defeats at the hands of the Swiss and of the duke of Lorraine whose lands he had seized. In the last of these, at

An invasion by
Edward IV. of
England.

Nancy, Charles was killed and Louis relieved of his greatest enemy. He had already taken summary vengeance upon nearly all the allies of Charles in France, his brother was dead, and now he took advantage of the fact that Charles's only heir was his daughter, Mary, to seize upon all his French possessions upon one pretext or another, and so remove the danger upon the north-east. The great duchy of Burgundy was recovered by the crown, never to be lost again, and for a time even the county of Burgundy—Franche-Comté—was occupied, though France had no claim upon it. Mary was in Flanders, and the people of that country had no interest in preserving the great state of which Charles had striven to make them a part. They were rather glad to see it broken up than otherwise. Mary was without protectors, and though she tried to gain one by marrying herself to Maximilian of Austria, son of the emperor Frederick, who was one of the several princes to whom she had been promised by her father, this marriage did not avail to save her more than the Low Countries. It was, however, one of the most eventful of marriages for the future of European history. By it the House of Hapsburg, which was to be the great rival of France for more than two hundred years, was given most valuable possessions on the immediate frontiers of France, possessions toward which the ambition of France would most naturally turn when the age of foreign conquest should arrive. In the mean time France profited greatly from the annexations which Louis had been able to make in consequence of the death of Charles.

Nor were these the only territorial gains of France under Louis XI. The dying out of the family of the counts of Anjou enabled Louis to take possession of most of the great inheritance of that branch of the royal

Charles the Bold killed, 1477.

Louis seizes Burgundy.

Mary of Burgundy marries Maximilian of Austria.

Consequences of the marriage.

Provence
annexed.

family, with their claims on the kingdom of Naples. This included one territory new to France, the county of Provence, east of the Rhone, and belonging to the Empire, land foreign in language and in feeling and not calling itself French for many generations. Roussillon was also obtained from Aragon, carrying the French frontier to the Pyrenees. The reign of the king who fought with words and gold, and not with arms, is one of the most successful in the history of French expansion.

Louis XI. an
absolute king,

A king of the character of Louis XI. was not likely to let any of the royal prerogatives which other kings had gained drop from his hands. His government was entirely a personal government. He chose his officers and agents with great skill, and often from persons of low station who would be wholly dependent upon his will. The Estates General he repressed as his father had done, using in their place assemblies of notables, whose membership was selected with care. The taxes he increased at will until they were quadrupled. The army he made still less a popular force than it had been, by the more extensive employment of mercenaries, and the long special devotion of the Swiss to the military service of the French kings began with him. The clear conception which he had of the fact that all France was now one can be seen in the plan which he had in mind, long before its execution was really possible, of a single national code of law to take the place of the varying local *coutumes*, which still had force for the cases which they covered.

but at the point
of transition
from feudal to
modern France.

Louis is in one sense the last of the kings of feudal France, the last who had a really dangerous conflict with enemies who sought its dismemberment, as Charles the Bold confessed he did in his famous saying that he

loved France so well that he would like to give her six kings in place of one. He was still more truly the first king of the modern era, who governed without a constitutional check upon his will and who set in motion the machinery of foreign diplomacy for the aggrandizement of France.

Charles VIII. was only thirteen years old when he succeeded his father, and the government fell into the hands of his eldest sister, Anne of Beaujeau, a princess of very unusual ability. It was a favorable moment for a reaction against the policy of Louis XI., and the discontented elements found a leader in Louis of Orleans, the first prince of the blood, who thought himself unjustly deprived of the regency. Anne de Beaujeau was obliged to allow the meeting of the Estates General which was demanded, and this assembly when it came together exhibited in a surprising degree characteristics which have marked French legislatures at critical points of the last hundred years. It denounced the abuses of the government with great freedom and made out long lists of reforms to be carried out; speeches were made proclaiming ideas, most advanced for that day, of the right of the people to determine everything, and of the responsibility of the king to them; it was voted that no taxes should be levied without the consent of the Estates, that this consent should be valid for two years only, and that hereafter the Estates General should meet every two years. But they ended with words. They did not know how to act and they took no practical steps toward securing the rights they had made speeches about. It was almost a hundred years before the Estates met again and they met only seven times in the next three hundred years.

Charles VIII.,
1483-1498.

A reaction
during his
minority.

The Estates
General did not
know how to
improve the
opportunity.

"The fools' war."

Brittany annexed.

Louis of Orleans was not satisfied with the result and foolishly appealed to arms, aided by the duke of Brittany, the last one left of the old great barons of France. A single battle put down their insurrection, and its only

result was the marriage of the young king with the heiress of Brittany by which that duchy was finally absorbed in France. In order to make this marriage, Charles had to repudiate Margaret of Burgundy, the daughter of Maximilian and Mary, to whom he had been betrothed by his father, and to send her home from Paris where she was being brought up as the future queen. A step like this had necessarily to be followed by concessions of some sort, and Charles gave up to Maximilian Artois and Franche-Comté, and to Ferdinand of Spain, Roussillon,



MEDALLIONS OF CHARLES VIII. AND ANNE OF BRITTANY.

while Henry VII., of England, was kept at peace by a payment of money.

In making these concessions, however, Charles had the future in mind as well as the past. There was nothing more to be feared from any enemies within the

Charles determines upon foreign conquests.

kingdom. Thanks to the exertions of his father and grandfather the king had large revenues and a splendid army, well organized and equipped in a way then thoroughly modern. It is not to be thought strange that Charles looked forward to an opportunity to make use of these weapons provided to his hands, and determined to assert the rights to the crown of Naples, which he had inherited. Historians have been accustomed to lament the consequences of the ambition of Charles VIII., in the relation thus established with Italy and its influence upon France. Undoubtedly it was the parent of many wars for that country, especially in the following century. Much Italian noble and princely blood was mingled with that of France, and with it came something of the Italian character, cruelty, deceit, and Machiavelian methods. But the situation is to be blamed rather than the king, and though Charles certainly did not inherit the cold wisdom of his father, it is to be doubted if the world could have produced at that time a monarch so wise as to have resisted the temptation—a temptation to which sovereign after sovereign, of France and Spain and Austria, yielded, so long as Italy was the one country of Europe especially open to conquest.

Effects upon
France of the
Italian con-
nection.

Italy was then in a particularly tempting condition. Milan was in the hands of an intriguing usurper; Ludovico the Moor. At Florence, Lorenzo the Magnificent had converted the "boss" rule of the Medici into a real but still disguised despotism. He had now just died, and Savonarola was exciting the democratic prejudices of the people by his passionate eloquence, and predicting the woes that would follow the foreign invader. Alexander VI. was pope and was striving to form a principality in central Italy for his son Cæsar Borgia.

Condition of
Italy.

The French
invited.

In Naples, or more accurately the continental one of the two kingdoms into which the kingdom of Sicily had been divided, which was the especial object of Charles's expedition, the reigning king, of the House of Aragon, had made himself disliked. From all sides invitations came to Charles to descend into Italy, and if he had been a wiser man than he was he would probably still have gone.

Charles invades
Italy.

With his fine army Charles crossed the Alps in September, 1494, and carried everything before him. At Florence, the people drove out the Medici, established the republic of Savonarola, and opened the gates to Charles. At Rome, the pope submitted much against his will. The king of Naples found himself powerless to resist, and Charles made a magnificent entry into his new capital at the beginning of 1495. But his power fell as quickly as it had been constructed. His Neapolitan subjects were restless under the taxes which he laid upon them. Ferdinand of Spain was beginning to move against him. Ludovico the Moor and Maximilian of Austria were uniting to oppose his retreat. Even Henry VII. of England was ready to take part with his enemies. All Europe seemed conspiring against him, and on the 20th of May he left Naples to return to France. One battle he had to fight in northern Italy, but it was a victory for the French and secured their retreat.

Rapid successes
and rapid loss.

Charles VIII. did nothing more in the short remainder of his life but to amuse himself. He died as the result of an accident in 1498, and as his children had all died before him, the throne went to Louis of Orleans, who had been the head of the rebellion early in his reign and who was the grandson of that duke of Orleans who had been murdered in the streets of Paris by the duke of Burgundy in the reign of Charles VI.

Louis XII. was a king of great good-will who loved to be called the father of his country. He announced that the king of France did not avenge the injuries of the duke of Orleans, and he kept his word. Anxious for the happiness of his people, and careful not to increase their financial or military burdens, he saw France prospering during his reign, though he was constantly involved in the tangle of Italian wars.

Louis XII.,
1498-1515.

A good-natured
king.

The quick succession of the Italian events of this reign, leading as they did to no permanent results, it is hardly profitable to follow in detail. To the claims of Charles VIII. on Naples, he added claims of his own upon the duchy of Milan, derived from his grandmother, Valentine Visconti, and Milan was the first object of his attention. The king's army speedily gained possession of the duchy, and when it revolted from the heavy rule of Louis's lieutenant, it was as quickly reconquered, and Ludovico the Moor was sent to spend the rest of his life in a French prison. Louis then began to consider the reconquest of Naples, upon which also Ferdinand of Spain had claims which he was now ready to assert. He proposed to Louis a partition of the kingdom between them, and Louis accepted the proposal. But Ferdinand was a far more skillful diplomatist and political manipulator than Louis, and when the work was done the French king found that he had merely aided his rival to occupy the country to his own exclusion. The armies which he sent into Spain and Italy to obtain satisfaction were defeated, and Louis had to drop his claims on Naples for a time. In the mean time Julius II. had become pope, a fitting pope for the Italy of the beginning of the sixteenth century, a monarch and a statesman, full of plans for the enlargement and centralization of the papal states, but not a pastor. As a Geno-

New claims in
Italy.

Ferdinand of
Spain out-
maneuvers
Louis.

Pope Julius II.

ese he hated Venice, and Venice was also the first obstacle in the path which he had marked out. With genuine Italian skill he formed the League of Cambrai, in which he united Louis, Ferdinand, and Maximilian against the Venetians. In the war which followed, it was French arms which gained the victories and occupied the Venetian lands in northern Italy. This was more than the pope desired. The French were now too strong for his purposes, and he immediately reversed his policy and formed the Holy League, in which Louis's old allies were joined against him with Venice, the Swiss, and the young Henry VIII. of England, who had just come to the throne and was ambitious to make a name for himself and to have his share in the scramble for foreign conquests. This was too strong a combination for the French. Their armies were defeated and finally driven out of Italy, and their enemies were victorious on every frontier. Louis was compelled to make peace, and his Italian wars, though made glorious by the exploits of Bayard, the chevalier without fear and without reproach, and of Gaston de Foix, who was killed at the age of twenty-two already a great general, closed with none of those great conquests which they had at one time seemed about to make for France.

The pope could not allow a strong power to form in Italy. It would threaten the independence of the papal states.

Louis loses his conquests.

Francis I.,
1515-1547.

His character.

Louis left no son, and his successor was his cousin and son-in-law, the young and brilliant Francis I., count of Angoulême. Brilliant he was, but superficially so. A great lover of pleasure and excitement, and ambitious of glory rather than of real success, he was without the qualities of mind or of character which would have made a great king. Though France made a brave fight in his reign against great odds and came off with no apparent loss, it was a time of real disaster and exhaustion, and it was more than a hundred years afterwards before she

really occupied in Europe the place which she had seemed about to take in the reign of Louis XII. and at the beginning of that of Francis I.

The reign of Francis I. is an age of great change in the foreign relations of France. This was not due to any change in France itself, but to something entirely without, to the fact that there were now brought together in the hands of Charles V. the interests and the resources of the three greatest rivals and enemies which France had had since the accession of Louis XI., Charles the Bold of Burgundy, Maximilian of Austria, and Ferdinand of Spain. It was the beginning and the first stage of the long duel between France and the House of Hapsburg for supremacy in Europe, but it differs so completely in almost every feature from the great age of that conflict, the seventeenth century, that we easily lose sight of this rivalry in the other interests which are involved.

Beginning of the long rivalry between France and the House of Hapsburg.

Francis I. was twenty years old when he began to reign, and he was not likely, with his ambitious nature, to forget the claims which he had inherited in Italy. He immediately prepared for an invasion, forced his way through the Alps, and on the 14th of September, 1515, gained the great victory of Marignano, in which the Swiss, who were so accustomed to victory as to consider themselves invincible, were completely overcome. All northern Italy lay open before him, but the victory was followed by two events which had a far more permanent influence upon the future of France.

Francis invades Italy.

A great victory.

In December he met Pope Leo X. at Bologna and soon arranged with him the Concordat by which the independence of the French Church was destroyed in the interests of the financial necessities of the pope and of the absolutist principles of the king. For some generations the French Church had enjoyed an independence un-

The Concordat with Leo X.

The Pragmatic
Sanction of
Bourges, 1438.

usual in Europe. Taking advantage of the troubles which had been occasioned in the church by the Great Schism, growing out of the residence of the popes at Avignon, Charles VII. had established by a royal ordinance—the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges—principles which had been adopted in an assembly of



FRANCIS I.

the French clergy. The object aimed at was independence of the pope, and the ordinance forbade any payment to him of "annates," or "reservations," most lucrative sources of the papal income, and deprived him of all rights of nomination to French bishoprics and abbeys, restoring to the church the canonical right of election. This

It made the
church too
independent to
suit the kings.

proved effective against the pope, but equally effective against the king, who found himself deprived of the right of appointment to vacant benefices. Some of Charles's successors had shown themselves not unwilling to do away with this independence if it could be done without giving too much to the pope, but opportunity had not served. Now Francis and Leo determined to destroy it for their own purposes. To the pope was restored the right of collecting the first

year's income from newly filled benefices. The king gained the right of making nominations to the exclusion of any canonical election. The French Church itself was not consulted on these changes and protests from France were of no avail. The king determined the question by his absolute will, and his will was law. Henceforth the Church of France was a royal institution and its offices were available as pensions and rewards for the king's friends.

The Church of France put under the king's control.

At about the same time, the king closed with the Swiss the "perpetual peace," by which they agreed to allow France to enlist among them such mercenaries as she might need, and Francis agreed that they should be paid a perpetual subsidy. This proved to be really a perpetual peace so long as the old *régime* lasted, for it continued in force until the Revolution.

The "perpetual peace" with the Swiss.

Francis was now undisputed duke of Milan and supreme in north Italy, but at the same moment the first step was taken toward the formation of that enormous Hapsburg power which was to hold him in check during all the remainder of his reign. In 1516, Ferdinand of Spain died, and was succeeded in all his possessions and all his claims, Spain, Italy, and America, by his grandson, Charles of Austria, who was already sovereign of the Low Countries and Franche-Comté—all that was left of the dominions of Charles the Bold. In 1519 died Charles's other grandfather, the emperor Maximilian I., leaving him not merely possessions in Austria, but some hereditary right to expect the election to the Empire. The power thus united in the hands of Charles would seem to be so great as to transform the struggle at once for France from one for foreign conquests into one for the preservation of her national independence. The lands of Charles surrounded France from north to

The vast power of Charles V.

south. The vast wealth of the Netherlands and of Mexico and Peru could be drawn upon. The Spanish infantry was rivaled only by the Swiss, the Spanish navy by none.

France had some advantages.

But the conflict was not really so unequal as it seemed. France was highly centralized; all its resources, and they were not few, were at the absolute disposal of the king, while Charles's lands were scattered, they had no common interests, and in the richest of them, the Netherlands, the will of the ruler was very far from being law. In addition, Germany was just dividing into two hostile camps, for these were the first days of the Reformation, and the Turks were about to resume their efforts to annex the whole Danube Valley to their empire. Charles had under his rule the greatest empire since Charlemagne, but an empire which faced him with difficulties which would have taxed the genius of Charlemagne, and that Charles did not have.

Francis and Charles are rivals for the position of emperor.

Francis's first move was one of some skill though he could in the end have gained nothing by it. The death of Maximilian left the Empire vacant. Charles might expect to succeed him without dispute. But the office was elective, subject to the choice of the seven electoral princes of Germany, and it was in theory the old Roman Empire. Any prince in Christendom might aspire to be elected. Furthermore Francis had possession of large territories that belonged to the Empire, almost the whole of north Italy in fact, from the Rhone to the Adriatic, and he at once announced himself a candidate. The German electors strove in most shameful rivalry to make for themselves all that they could from the election, but Francis spent his money in vain. The election went to Charles, who thus became the emperor Charles V.

There was a third sovereign at the time in Europe

whose alliance was desired by both the rivals in the coming conflict. England had recovered from the Wars of the Roses. The financial policy of Henry VII., the first Tudor king, had filled her treasury, and her riches and strength were out of proportion to her area. Her king also, Henry VIII., like Charles and Francis, young and ambitious, was determined to recover in some form the position which England had once had upon the Continent. The attempt of Francis to win Henry in the famous meeting of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, a fortnight's rivalry in lavish expenditure, was rendered futile by the more skillful diplomacy of Charles V., who knew how to flatter both Henry and his powerful minister, Cardinal Wolsey; the prospect of succeeding Leo X. as pope was enough to determine the cardinal and to shape the policy of England as Charles would have it. As events turned out, however, the alliance of England was of little value to either party.

Henry VIII. of
England

secured by
Charles V.

The position of Leo X. in Italy was of more importance. He had entered into friendly relations with Francis after the battle of Marignano, but only because he had been obliged to do so. The traditional policy of the popes had been for centuries to prevent the growth of any state in Italy which would be strong enough to threaten the independence of their own little kingdom, the States of the Church. The extension of France over almost the whole valley of the Po was a most serious danger. Leo showed himself ready to join with Charles, and the alliance was gladly accepted. The first result of the agreement was the decision of the Diet of Worms against Luther in 1521. The second was the driving of the French from Italy. Just at the moment also France suffered another loss in the desertion of one of her ablest generals, the constable Charles of Bourbon, who be-

Leo X. is also
his ally.

Luther con-
demned in the
Diet of Worms
and the French
driven from
Italy.

lieved himself defrauded by the king of the inheritance of the elder line of Bourbon, which had become extinct, and to avenge himself he passed into the service of the king's enemies.

Francis invades Italy again.

Feb. 25, 1525.

Francis a prisoner at Madrid.

Francis was not the one to submit quietly to these reverses. At the end of 1524, with a fine army he drove back Charles of Bourbon, who had invaded Provence, and within a few weeks he had recovered Milan. But he lost all as speedily by his imprudence at the battle of Pavia, where his army was destroyed and himself captured. A year's imprisonment in Spain forced him to sign the treaty of Madrid, in which he agreed to abandon all claims upon Italy and to give up to Charles the duchy of Burgundy which had been held by the French since Louis XI. had seized it on the death of Charles the Bold. Charles had set his demands too high and Francis repudiated the treaty after his release.

Clement VII. finds Charles V. too strong.

La Paix des Dames, 1529.

But now the position which Charles held in Italy was as great a danger to the pope as the position of Francis had been earlier, and the new pope, Clement VII., Leo's second successor, at once entered into a league with Francis for the expulsion of the Spaniards from Italy, and this league was soon joined by Henry VIII. The war which followed is of interest chiefly for the sack of Rome in 1527 by the army of Charles V., composed largely of German Protestants, in which the Rome of art and of the monuments of antiquity suffered severely. At one time Francis seemed on the point of conquering Naples, but his army was destroyed by a pestilence, and the war was closed, with no great success on either side, by the peace of Cambrai, called the Ladies' Peace, because it was negotiated by Charles's aunt, Margaret of Burgundy, and Louise of Savoy, the mother of Francis.

Another war followed after an interval, and then an-

other still, all without decisive results for either side, though France lost the most of her Italian conquests. Early in 1547, Francis I. died, just after the death of Henry VIII. Charles V. was to live for ten years yet, but years of such ill success that he was ready to close his reign before his life and make way for others by voluntary abdication. France had had many enemies and few allies in this reign. She had spent much treasure and many lives in ambitious plans abroad, and she had nothing to show for it. But she had saved her national independence and her territories that were really national from great dangers, and she had no reason to regret the result.

Results of the reign of Francis I.

The period which this chapter covers, from the beginning of the reign of Louis XI. to the close of that of Francis I., is a time of as great change in every department of the national life of France as that which took place in her foreign policy. It was the age in which the nation passed out of the Middle Ages and entered into modern times. In political and social, economical and intellectual life, the nation was revolutionized.

An age of change.

The feudal system was now at an end. "There were no longer vassals or suzerains, only the king and his subjects." The place of the feudal barons was taken by the nobility. Life at the king's court became more attractive than life in the castle. The noble did not strive, as the baron had, for political independence, for rule over lands and serfs, but for titles, offices, and pensions, which the king's favor alone could confer. In this period arose that nobility of the ancient *régime*, and that social life centered in the royal palace, which the Revolution brought to an end. The reason for this transformation lies on the surface. As the king destroyed the

The noble takes the place of the feudal baron.

The cause of the change.

political independence of the baron, the power which the baron had once exercised all passed into his own hands. The baron no longer able to govern his fief, and therefore not interested in extending it in the old fashion, began to look naturally for the satisfaction of his ambition to the only source left in France from which increase of wealth or dignity could come, the royal favor. The king, to keep the power which he had gained, attached the nobles to his person, made his court brilliant and attractive, and multiplied offices and titles, to content them with the shadow, while he enjoyed the substance.

A like change in the church.

At the same time the French Church underwent a similar change. The Concordat of Francis I. with Leo X. placed it at the disposal of the king, and he made use of its offices and its revenue as he did of those of the state. It became a school for statesmen, and a refuge for the younger branches of the nobility—in a word, the church of the ancient *régime*, which could give, at the beginning of its history, a cure to Rabelais and at the close a bishopric to Talleyrand.

The change in the middle class.

The *bourgeois* felt the force of the same influences. The commune was no more able to preserve its independence of local government from the advance of the royal centralization than the baron had been. And the burgher began to feel the attraction of the same brilliant court life that reconciled the noble to the change. The offices of the government, the courts, the councils, and the treasury, open to the *bourgeois*, furnished them a ladder of promotion and an entry into the palace. With the absorption of all functions in the king, the idea came in, unknown to the early feudal state, that the king's patent could make a man a noble, though in France it never was able to put him quite on a level with the old noble of many generations. The new family could,

The king acquires the power to make nobles.

however, in time acquire the generations, and some of the great noble houses of the later days of the old *régime* were founded in this period by merchant burghers. There began now to be formed also that class distinctive of France, the nobles of the robe—the official class of certain ranks, ennobled by their offices, but not considered equal in rank with the nobles of the sword, forming thus a class by itself between the *bourgeois* and the nobles. The growth of such a class was made easy by the introduction of the practice, under Louis XII., of selling appointments to public offices, the judgeships, for example, for sums of money paid into the king's treasury, and this soon developed into selling the hereditary right to the office. The practice formed an important source of revenue to the state under the old *régime*, but the abuses created by it are self-evident.

Nobles of the robe.

The sale of public offices.

The peasants were far less favorably situated to take advantage of the change of ideas and of the new opportunities of promotion of this age, but there is abundant evidence to show that they too made their way in some numbers into the aristocracy. Actual serfdom disappeared from France during this period, except in certain backward or peculiarly situated districts. Villanage did not, however, and the land, and therefore its cultivator, remained heavily burdened with financial obligations and troublesome services, due to the descendant or the representative of its old feudal holder. The steadily increasing burden of the land tax rested upon them also, and in this period the peasant was only just beginning to recover economically from the desolations of the English wars.

The peasant class.

Intellectually two great revolutions were taking place in this age which affected all Europe and France with the rest, though it had a leading share in neither. The

The Renaissance and the Reformation.

Renaissance, of which Italy was the center, reached its highest point and began its decline, and the Reformation, of which Germany was the center, began and made its most extensive conquests within the limits of this chapter. The first of these two movements affected France far more widely, bringing all classes more directly under its influence, than the second. The connection with Italy was favorable to it, and the Italian influence makes itself strongly felt in this and the next period in many ways. In literature, leaving Calvin aside as finding his proper place rather in connection with the Reformation, this age produces two names which have had a permanent popular fame throughout the world, Rabelais, the grotesque satirist, and the story-teller, Margaret of Valois, queen of Navarre and sister of Francis I. In art, France produced of its own no names of equal eminence, unless we reckon here the name of the potter, Bernard of Palissy, but Francis I. was a great lover of beautiful things, and he attracted to his court some of the eminent artists of Italy, like Leonardo da Vinci and Benvenuto Cellini, who produced some of their works under his patronage.

Literature

and art.

An age of
general activity.

Space does not permit a full statement of the activities of this age, which is a period of especial interest not merely because the features which are so characteristic of France under the old *régime* were then taking shape, but also because it was in itself a time of new life and of most promising beginnings. Printing was introduced and received, with some rare exceptions, the royal protection; Louis XII. called it "an invention which seems more divine than human." France strove to have her share in the maritime discoveries of the time, and under Francis I. laid the foundation in the New World, by the explorations of Verrazano and Cartier, of the

The New
World
included.

great empire which she was to claim in the future. Manufactures and commerce felt the benefit of the strengthening of the royal authority, especially in the greater safety of the roads and in the abolition of illegal tolls. Havre was founded as the port of Paris. The machinery of government was greatly enlarged, the pressure of increased business compelling the bodies into which the original king's court, the *curia regis*, had divided—the Parlement, the Council, and the Chamber of Accounts—still further to divide themselves into different courts and councils, each with its own particular line of affairs. French now took the place of Latin as the language of official business, a sure sign of the growth of a new national consciousness.

Institutional progress.

In one way only were traces left of the old feudal fragments of France, and evidences of the way in which the nation had been put together. This was in the provincial differences which the kings allowed to remain because they made no serious flaw in the real centralization of France. Some provinces had their own supreme courts, the provincial parlements; the *pays d'états* had their provincial legislatures, and some of these retained the right of voting the taxes and even of collecting them by their own officers; great diversities still remained in the local law; and along many provincial boundary lines, the custom-house reminded the merchant or traveler of a past feudal independence which he could detect in no other way. These differences remained until the Revolution, but they remained because they no longer prevented the existence of a French nation, one and undivided.

Provincial differences still remaining.

For map of this period see first lining page.

CHAPTER XI.

THE RELIGIOUS CIVIL WARS.

Henry II.,
1547-1559.

A transitional
reign.

THE reign of Henry II. seems at first glance out of place in a chapter devoted to the religious civil wars of France, for these wars did not begin until his reign was ended. But the reign of Henry II. is of a clearly transitional character, and it seems on the whole to be more distinctly characterized by the rise of the new than by the continuation of the old. It foreshadows the new direction which French foreign policy was to take so soon as France should be free to devote herself once more to foreign designs, and it sees the rise of the influences and of the personages who were to determine the history of this period.

France turns
to the Rhine
frontier.

Henry was a lover of war and he had no intention of abandoning the claims of his father upon Italy, but his reign is the one in which these pretensions were abandoned, and in which a new direction was given to the French desire for conquest—a direction at once more easily justifiable upon reasonable grounds, and more promising of a permanent success—the extension of the French frontier in the valley of the Rhine.

The opportunity for the first advance in this direction came to Henry through the religious civil war in Germany. It was only in 1547 that Charles V., after various attempts which he had not been able to carry through, had found himself so far relieved of outside difficulties that he could attempt to subdue Protestant Germany by force of arms. The emperor was at first

successful and the Protestant princes, in despair of protecting themselves, turned to France for assistance. The inducements which they were prepared to offer were attractive, and Henry was not slow to respond.

The German Protestants ask Henry to come to their aid.

He was to furnish the money which the Protestant princes needed to reconstruct their forces, and in return he was to be allowed to take possession of certain cities—including Metz, Toul, and Verdun, "which have always belonged to the Empire but where the German language is not used." The cities mentioned are the famous three bish-



HENRY II.

oprics—little ecclesiastical states on the borders of Lorraine—the first annexation by France of German territory in that direction. This agreement is also the first indication of that argument of which the French have made so much use in later times and which has had such extended application in Europe in the present century—that the boundaries of the state should be made to correspond with the boundaries of the language. At this time, also, they began to talk in Paris about Austrasia, as if the old Austrasia of the Merovingian dynasty must naturally belong to the

The first step toward the Rhine.

descendants of the counts of Paris. These things have their greatest importance, however, not in themselves, but as indications of the change which was taking place in the feelings of the French—a change of the utmost significance for their future history. They were beginning to turn from Italy as the direction in which to look for foreign conquests, toward the frontier lands of Germany, which was so weak and divided as to be almost as incapable of defending its territories as Italy.

Charles tries to recover the three bishoprics,

Henry got possession of the three bishoprics without difficulty. But Charles V. could not be expected to submit quietly to a seizure of imperial territories by his life-long enemies. The last part of his war with the German Protestants went decidedly against him, and he at last made an agreement with them out of which grew the celebrated peace of Augsburg which regulated the religious affairs of Germany until the Thirty Years' War of the next century. It was an agreement which made this first religious war a drawn battle—each religion was forced to recognize the existence of the other—but when it had been made Germany was ready to unite to try to recover the land which had been given to France. With a great army Charles laid siege to Metz, which was bravely defended for France by Francis, duke of Guise. After something more than three months the emperor abandoned the attempt and the three bishoprics remained to France.

but without success.

Charles V. abdicates.

In its foreign relations the reign of Henry II. is distinguished for two other events of importance. In 1555 the emperor Charles V., old before his time, discouraged by the repeated ill successes of his later years, abdicated his various crowns and retired to the monastery of Yuste to secure the safety of his soul. This abdication resulted in a division of the great Haps-

burg dominion which he had united under his rule. His brother Ferdinand became emperor and inherited the Austrian lands. Spain, the Netherlands, and Italy went to his son Philip II. This was a division of the Hapsburg territories, but it was no relief to France. Charles had drawn but little strength from Germany or Austria, and Philip, who had all the lands that bordered France, was as bitter an enemy of the French as his father had been, and he was a narrower man and more obstinate and tenacious.

Philip II. of Spain.

Philip succeeded in bringing England into the war against France by his marriage with Queen Mary, and this led to the only French success of any value during the war, and to the second event of importance during the last part of Henry's reign, the recapture of Calais by the duke of Guise, the last bit that remained to the English of their former vast possessions in France. France defended herself with success against the Spanish invasion, which appeared at one time a serious danger, but at the close of the war found herself deprived of almost the last foot of Italian soil which she had held. It was some consolation that Elizabeth, who had now become queen on the death of Mary, was willing for the sake of peace to leave Calais in the hands of France.

England joins Philip, and loses Calais.

These wars of Henry II. are noteworthy not merely for the change of direction in French foreign interests which takes place in consequence, but also for the rise to influence upon national affairs of two noble families who were to have a large share in the events of the immediate future. One was the House of Guise, descended through a younger line from the dukes of Lorraine and with pretensions to a royal rank. Francis, duke of Guise, the first of this house to win a great name, was one of the most trusted generals of Henry II. The other family

Rise of the Guises.

Admiral
Coligny.

was that of Châtillon, whose most famous member, the admiral Coligny, by his brave defense of St. Quentin, in 1557, checked the most dangerous Spanish invasion of the war. The Italian policy of Francis I. had given to his son Henry a wife from that country, whose name is famous, or infamous, in the annals of France, Catherine de Medici, but her husband allowed her no share in public affairs, and so long as he lived she was without influence.

Catherine de
Medici.

Francis II.,
1559-1560.

Henry was killed in 1559 by an accident in a tournament which was held in Paris to celebrate the conclusion of peace and the marriage of the king's daughter with Philip II. He left the throne to his son Francis II., who is chiefly remembered as the husband of Mary Stuart, but whose reign of a year and a half inaugurated the religious civil wars.

A general de-
mand for a
reformation.

The same influence in the religious world which led to the beginning of the Reformation proper in the work of Luther, led in France to a similar beginning, which found public expression even earlier than in Germany, and was characterized by all those traits of protestantism which were purely religious, as distinguished from the theological peculiarities of Luther. These influences, indeed, were strong and deep in all the countries of Europe throughout the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. The demand for a reformation was universal, not in the later sense of a profound change in the doctrines and forms of the medieval church, but as a demand for a moral and spiritual reformation to do away with the ecclesiastical abuses which were recognized by all and restore to the church a more spiritual Christianity. In one direction this demand gave rise to the Protestant Reformation; in

another to ecclesiastical reform, stimulated by rebellion perhaps, in the Catholic Church. That the beginning of a religious teaching like that of Luther, which goes back in France into the reign of Louis XII., would have led to such a result as the formation of the great Huguenot party without the influence of the German Protestant Revolution may very well be doubted. It certainly prepared the way for more extreme teachings and for a complete separation from the old church.

An independent beginning of the Reformation in France.

Having an independent origin and distinctive features of its own, the French Reformation soon received an independent system of theology and of church organization, which not merely preserved its peculiarities and saved it from being absorbed in the German movement, so much stronger at the start, but which also gave it the strength of organization and of a definite body of belief, and a power and position in France which it might not otherwise have had. This was the work of Calvin. Born at Noyon, not far from Paris, of a family connected with the church, he was provided with benefices from his childhood, and was educated by his father for the practice of the law. He would have been no doubt a great lawyer, for his was a mind profoundly legal and logical. But while still a student he adopted the new faith, surrendered his benefices, and, taking refuge at Basle from a temporary persecution under Francis I., he published there, in 1535, when he was just past his twenty-sixth birthday, the first edition of his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," the most profound work of Protestant theology, and one of the greatest in the philosophical history of the world. This work he afterwards enlarged and, in 1541, he published a French translation, afterwards many times republished. The influence of this book upon the French literature and

John Calvin.

The "Institutes of the Christian Religion."

language was strong and lasting, but its greatest results were produced, as intended, in the religious field, giving to the protestantism of France definiteness and the means of organization.

It must be admitted that the Protestant body in France received accessions from a source not distinctly religious, elements led to join it from other motives, and

The French Protestants were of the middle and higher classes.



COSTUME OF THE TIME OF HENRY II.

from this fact undoubtedly some of the evils of the religious civil wars arose. The lower classes, who in Germany and in England passed almost in a body over to the new faith, in France mostly remained faithful to the old church. The middle and higher classes furnished the main body of French Protestants—the richer burghers of the towns and the nobles of the country districts.

This was particularly the case with the nobles of the southwestern part of France, in the country between the Loire and the Pyrenees. But intense devotion to the Reformation principles was not always the strongest motive with these nobles. This was a part of France which had been

Their motives not always purely religious.

brought under the Capetian monarchy only recently. It had long been practically independent under the English rule, and something of the old feudal feeling still survived there—not merely dislike of the French rule, but especially of the strong government of the king. Protestantism gained among this class when it became evident that it was likely to be a separating and dividing influence in the state. Apparently still less worthy motives influenced some—the hope of a complete revolution in the state which should lead, after the example of the Protestant states of Germany and of England, to the confiscation of the rich endowment lands of the church and to their distribution among the nobles. The Protestant body in France contained, from these sources, a political element which stood ready to fight a carnal battle and even to listen to conspirators who were planning murder and treason.

Some remains
of feudal feeling,

and some desire
of revolution.

Francis II. was fifteen years old when his father died. Legally he was of age, but in mind he was still unfit to rule, and a rivalry for the control of the king and the government had its bearing on the beginning of the civil wars. Francis was under the influence of his wife, Mary Stuart. Her mother was a sister of the duke of Guise and naturally she threw her influence in favor of her relatives, with the result that so long as Francis lived the government was entirely in the hands of the duke of Guise and of his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine. The princes of the Bourbon family stood the nearest to the crown after Francis and his younger brothers, though they were only distantly related to the king. They naturally believed that the greatest position at the court belonged to them, and they resented the rule of the Guises as that of upstarts and foreigners. All parties in France who were dissatisfied with the government

Mary Stuart.

The formation
of parties.

The Bourbon
princes.

looked to them for leadership, and, as the Bourbons were Protestant, the country soon divided itself into two great factions, the one Protestant and Bourbon, the other Catholic with the Guises at its head. Antony of Bourbon, king of Navarre, through his marriage with the heiress of all that remained of that kingdom since the seizure of the Spanish portion of it by Ferdinand the Catholic, was the head of the Bourbon family, but he was of a vacillating character, not well fitted for leadership. His younger brother, the prince of Condé, was a man of more decision but not disposed at first to take the place which belonged to his brother.

The first step
toward civil
war.

The conspiracy
of Amboise.

1560.

The policy of the French government toward the Protestants had been a changeable and inconsistent one. Francis I. had sometimes persecuted and sometimes tolerated. Henry II. had intended to follow more closely a policy of repression, but he had not always done so. The Guises were disposed to be intolerant, and it was a step in this direction which they took in turning Protestants out of their employments and depriving Protestant nobles of their offices and pensions, which furnished the material for the conspiracy which may be regarded as the first open act in the civil wars, though actual war did not yet begin—the conspiracy of Amboise. This was a plot to seize the person of the king, to overthrow by force the government of the Guises, and to place the Bourbons in power. It was revealed before it could be put into execution, and the Guises took such bloody vengeance that the hangmen grew weary and the victims were drowned in batches in the Seine like dogs. They sought for proof which would involve the Bourbons in this conspiracy, especially the prince of Condé, but the evidence was insufficient. They felt themselves strong enough, however, to secure

his arrest upon another charge, and he was condemned to death, but the chancellor, l'Hôpital, a man of tolerant and moderate views, who had been appointed to office through the influence of Catherine de Medici, refused to sign the warrant, and during the delay which this caused the young king suddenly died and the power of the Guises instantly collapsed. Mary Stuart returned to Scotland to begin her dramatic and unhappy history there, and Catherine de Medici at last had scope for her ambition. Francis was succeeded by his brother, Charles IX., who was not yet eleven years old.

Charles IX.,
1560-1574.

In drawing the government into her hands, Catherine de Medici followed the plan of balancing one faction in the state against the other. To keep herself in power, she strove to prevent either party from becoming strong enough to deprive her of it. From political motives she adopted the policy of toleration which her minister, the chancellor Michel de l'Hôpital, advocated from principle. As the Guises were at the moment of the king's death too strong, her first step was to raise the party of the Bourbons to offset them. Condé was set at liberty. Antony was made lieutenant-general of the kingdom. Coligny was restored to his offices. They were all allowed to hold Protestant services in their apartments at the court, and an edict was issued suspending the punishment of heretics for a time and granting to certain places the privilege of Protestant worship.

The policy of
Catherine de
Medici

These acts naturally excited the alarm of the Catholics. The question ceased to be a merely political one with them, a question as to which party should control the king, and became chiefly religious. It became the question: Was the king going to adopt the new religion and carry the country with him, as the king of England had done? The leading Catholics began to

alarms the
Catholics.

take an attitude of opposition. The Parlement and the Sorbonne protested. The Jesuits began to make their influence felt. The pope and King Philip II. of Spain remonstrated. Catherine sought to balance these foreign allies of the Catholic party by seeking friends among the Protestant princes of Germany. Finally the constable, Montmorency, who was closely bound by family ties to Coligny, and who had held up to this time a neutral position though a Catholic, became alarmed for his faith and joined the Guises.

Still Catherine did not change her policy. In September, 1561, she held a public debate between representatives of the Protestant and of the Catholic clergy in the hope of finding some common ground of compromise. It served only to exasperate feeling still further. This, indeed, had been the chief result of her policy of toleration, and acts of violence on both sides became common under the eyes of the court. The Guises retired to their estates in the east with the intention of seeking help from abroad. Antony of Navarre, finding that he had gained no real power and trusting to the suggestion that Philip II. would find him compensation somewhere for Spanish Navarre, abandoned the Protestant and joined the Catholic party. Everything was ready for civil war. It needed only some act of especial violence, from either side, to begin it. This was furnished, on the first of March, 1562, by the "massacre of Vassy." The duke of Guise, on his way to Paris with a company of two hundred attendants, came to Vassy on Sunday morning. A large number of Protestants had assembled there for religious service in a barn. Some of the duke's followers interfered with their services, and one act led to another until it came to actual fighting, and many of the unarmed Protestants were killed or

Party feeling
grows still
more bitter.

The massacre
of Vassy.

wounded in spite of the efforts of the duke to stop the bloodshed.

From this time on until the final pacification under Henry IV. in 1598, there is an almost continuous civil war in France. In form the period is divided into separate wars. Four of them are counted in the reign of Charles IX., and four more in the reign of Henry III. These wars are separated from one another by formal treaties of peace, but none of these was more than a temporary suspension of hostilities, to try, it may be said, if intrigue would do what force had failed to accomplish. The details of these wars it is impossible to follow here. It may be said in general that the Huguenots had the worst of it in the fighting, and were usually granted very favorable terms in the treaties of peace.

Thirty-five
years of war.

In the first war Antony of Navarre was killed fighting on the Catholic side, and Duke Francis of Guise was assassinated, as his family firmly believed, though history does not, at the instigation of Coligny. It must be admitted, however, that Protestants as well as Catholics preached a doctrine at this time which came very near to justifying the murder of powerful enemies of the true faith, whichever that was. The new duke of Guise, Francis's son Henry, and his brothers, Charles, duke of Mayenne, and Louis, the second cardinal of Lorraine, were the chief leaders of the Catholic party in the following period. In the third war, the prince of Condé, the head of the Huguenot cause, was killed, but the brave queen of Navarre restored the spirits of the army by confiding to them the young princes, her son, Henry of Navarre, and his cousin, the new prince of Condé.

The first three
wars.

The peace of St. Germain which closed the third war introduced a practice which had important consequences in the future history of France. In order to give to the

The Protestant
cities of refuge.

Huguenots a feeling of security they were allowed to select four strong cities in which they should have the appointment of the governor and the right of placing their own garrisons. This was the beginning of the practice, difficult to drop when once begun, which was finally embodied in the edict of Nantes and which gave to the Protestants a position of semi-independence in the state, apparently of much advantage to them, but in reality a great source of danger when the policy of close centralization, interrupted for a time by these civil strifes, should be resumed.

Foreign interference.

Spain.

England.

As early as the first of these civil wars, foreign states, the enemies or rivals of France, began to show themselves ready to take advantage of the weakness of the nation. The Catholic party naturally looked for aid to Philip of Spain, the greatest sovereign of their church and heartily devoted to the restoration of catholicism, and Philip was anxious to respond. Had his hands been entirely free for action in France, he might have been able to free the House of Hapsburg from its most dangerous enemy of the immediate future. On the other hand, the Huguenots as naturally turned to Elizabeth of England. She was no more at liberty than Philip to profit in full measure by the opportunity. But she clearly showed that she was alive to her own interests when she demanded that Havre should be placed in her hands in return for her assistance. The Huguenots yielded to this demand, but when the war had closed they showed their unwillingness to allow a new Calais to be established on the French coast by uniting with the king's forces to drive the English out. It was the protection of France in this age of her weakness that her rivals were also fully occupied with their own domestic difficulties.

For one moment after the third war, France seemed about to resume her plans of foreign aggrandizement and to take advantage of the difficulties of Philip II. in the Low Countries. Charles escaped for a time from the influence of his mother. Coligny became the royal favorite and found Charles ready to listen as he unfolded his plans for the recovery of Flanders in alliance with the Protestants and for the establishment of French supremacy in the lower Rhine districts. If Charles had had only a trifle more decision of character when the moment for action came, the policy of Coligny would have been tried, and it looks to us, at this distance of time, as if it would have been successful. But Charles hesitated to take the final steps until it was too late.

Coligny's foreign plans.

If the influence of Coligny over the king did not lead to foreign conquests, it had momentous results at home. Catherine de Medici was filled with fear as she saw the control of Charles slipping from her hands and believed herself threatened with the total loss of power. She would not have been averse to a war with Philip II. for Flanders even in alliance with the Protestants, if it could have been under her direction. It was not the policy so much which she disliked as the loss of position. To save herself she came to an understanding with her second son, the duke of Anjou, and together they planned the murder of Coligny. The assassin whom they hired only wounded the admiral, and his influence with the king became stronger than ever. This failure meant necessarily open war. Catherine must now overthrow Coligny or suffer the loss of everything she was contending for.

Catherine de Medici threatened with the loss of power.

She plans the death of Coligny.

Then it was that she and her friends resolved to persuade the weak and irresolute king of the existence of a widespread Protestant conspiracy, directed both

against the person of the king and the safety of the state, which could only be overcome by striking down the leaders suddenly and secretly. Finally they so worked upon the feelings of Charles that, beside himself with fear and perplexity, he cried out to kill them all, that not one should be left to reproach him with the deed. They took him at his word and the massacre of St. Bartholomew was the result. It was an especially favorable opportunity to destroy the Protestant leaders, because large numbers of them had come up to Paris to attend the recent marriage of Henry of Navarre with the king's sister, Margaret of Valois, which was to seal and render permanent the peace just concluded. For three weeks the mob killed at will in Paris and the example was followed in the other cities of France. A most conservative estimate places the number of dead at two thousand for Paris, and between six and eight thousand in the provinces. The Protestants were not so crippled, however, but that they instantly took arms in the fourth civil war and secured very favorable terms of peace at its close.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew, 1572.

It led to another war.

Henry III., 1574-1589.

The Protestant Union, 1573-4.

Charles IX. was succeeded by his brother, Henry III., a most depraved and utterly worthless man. His reign is marked by the rapid progress of events toward the natural outcome of these long civil strifes, the dissolution and ruin of France. The first open step in this direction was taken even before the death of Charles IX., in the formation of the Protestant "Union." The cities and districts where protestantism was supreme took the local government into their own hands, and further formed themselves into a common, semi-national organization with estates general of their own. It was a kind of aristocratic republic, almost an independent state within the state, and in the end it must have been really so had

the civil wars continued. This was followed by the organization of the Catholic "League" of the more extreme and uncompromising Catholics with the Guises at their head and the Spaniards in close alliance. In the wars that followed Philip II. interfered more actively than ever in France. His money supported the League, and his troops were at its command ; some of its campaigns, indeed, were little else than Spanish invasions.

The Catholic League.

Between the Protestant Union on one side and the Catholic League on the other there seemed to be no future left for the united France which the long labors of the Capetians had only just brought into being. But the hope of the future lay with a new party which was now beginning to appear,



HENRY III.

composed mainly of Catholics under the lead of the Montmorencies and others. They were men tired of the long suicidal strife, and disgusted with its extremes, of moderate views themselves and anxious to secure a permanent peace on the basis of compromise and toleration. This was the party of the "*Politiques*."

The rise of the "*Politiques*."

The general policy which Henry III. attempted to

follow was that of alliance with neither of the two extreme parties, but to hold a position of his own over against them both. The only result of this policy was to isolate him completely and to deprive him of almost all the relics of authority which were still left the king. At last, in a desperate effort to relieve himself of the rival whom he could not overcome, he had the duke of Guise,

Henry III.
murders the
duke of Guise,



and allies him-
self with Henry
of Navarre.

who was the idol of the Parisians, murdered in the royal bed-chamber and almost at his own feet. The fury of the League at this act drove him into alliance with Henry of Navarre, with whom the *Politiques* were also acting. With great skill the Protestant Henry had been gaining lately one success after another, and now, with Henry III. on his side, he continued to ad-

COURT COSTUME, TIME OF HENRY III.

vance, until in the summer of 1598 they were able to lay siege to Paris, the stronghold of the League. Just as

they were ready to attempt the city by assault, Henry III. was murdered by a Dominican friar, acting upon the tyrannicide theories so freely preached on both sides.

Henry III.
killed.

The sudden death of Henry III. changed the whole situation. He was the last of the Valois. If the strict rule of succession, as established earlier by the Salic Law, was to hold, the king of France was Henry of Navarre. His line—the Bourbon—had branched from the parent stem far back in time, beyond the beginning of the Valois family even. His first crowned ancestor in the male line was Louis IX., who had been dead more than four hundred years. But all the intermediate lines, some forty in number, had become extinct, and there could not be the slightest doubt of his right to the crown. He was a heretic, however. The League could not accept a Protestant king. Henry, though he was not yet ready to become a Catholic, showed himself strongly in sympathy with the tolerant views of the *Politiques*, but this was not enough for the extreme Catholics. They looked about for some other king. The Guises had earlier advanced some pretensions of their own to the French crown, and had had prepared with care genealogical tables which showed their descent from Charlemagne and suggested an earlier and better right than that of the usurping Capetians. But even the Guises themselves could not seriously entertain the claim when it came to the actual test, and they sought out the nearest prince of the blood who was Catholic, Charles, cardinal of Bourbon, the uncle of Henry, and proclaimed him king as Charles X.

The question
of succession to
the throne.

The heir a
Protestant.

Henry conducted his cause with wisdom. He retired from Paris into the north of France; made arrangements for aid from England; and gained the two successes of Arques and Ivry. Then he laid siege to

Henry IV.,
1589-1610.

Paris and had almost starved it into surrender when the siege was raised by a Spanish army. The attempts of Philip II. to secure the throne of France for his daughter, with an Austrian archduke as her husband, began to turn the tide of public feeling against the League, as an ally of the foreign enemies of France, and this feeling was still further increased by a remarkable anonymous satire, the *Satire Ménippée*, which covered the League with ridicule.

Henry IV.
becomes a
Catholic.

Already Henry had signified his willingness to be instructed in the Catholic faith. He soon professed himself convinced of the error of his ways, and in July, 1593, solemnly renounced the Protestant faith and was received into the Catholic Church. To Henry the crown was worth the act. He was not a man who could have intense convictions, either from personal character or from the training of his life. Toleration was natural to him and he undoubtedly believed—an unusual belief in his day—that both religions were Christian.

He secures
the throne.

One by one his enemies and the Catholic cities submitted. War was openly declared against Spain, which could not easily be brought to understand that its opportunity for gain from the civil wars of France was past. But no success was gained on either side in this war, and in 1598 peace was made, leaving each country with the same boundaries which it had had at the death of Henry III. To a contemporary observer it might have seemed that the two states were in the same relative position as forty years before. But in truth Spain had been far more exhausted than France by the struggles of the last half century, and while the latter was about to enter upon a new career of conquest, the former was passing into an age of decline and decay from which she has not yet recovered,

Peace with
Spain.

A few days earlier than the signing of the peace with Spain, Henry had taken a step to secure the permanent internal peace of the kingdom which had been vainly sought so long. The edict of Nantes was signed April 13, 1598. This edict secured to the Huguenots toleration throughout all France. They could reside and hold their faith wherever they pleased. The offices of the state were open to them. Their form of worship could be publicly celebrated in certain specified places. Mixed judicial tribunals were organized for their protection in suits at law. They were still to hold the cities of surety and their garrisons were to be paid by the king. The government recognized their right to hold their synods for the management of their ecclesiastical affairs. The edict went even further than this and allowed them to keep up some of the semi-political arrangements of their Union, to hold their general assemblies, or estates general, once in three years, and to present their complaints to the government for redress. It was not religious liberty in our understanding of the term, for the Huguenot was not on quite the same footing in the community as the Catholic. He was tolerated, not absolutely equal. But it was going very far for the sixteenth century, and seemed to the pope and to the extreme Catholics a sinful surrender to the heretics. It was accepted by the nation, however, and it worked well in practice so far as its religious features were concerned. Under the peace which it secured France rapidly recovered from the losses of the past and entered upon a new period of prosperity. Its greatest defect proved to be in its political features, which broke the centralization of France and formed one of the very last strongholds of resistance to the perfect absolutism of the king.

The edict of
Nantes.

It secured, not
religious
liberty, but
toleration.

CHAPTER XII.

FRANCE AGAIN A EUROPEAN POWER.

The religious civil wars were almost a return to feudal anarchy.

Robber barons and peasant insurrections.

THE dozen years that Henry IV. reigned, to 1510, after he had established peace at home and abroad, were years of recuperation for France. The sufferings of the nation had, perhaps, not been so great in amount as during the Hundred Years' War with England, but they had been of the same kind. To a certain extent there had been a return to the methods of the feudal wars of an earlier age. It had been mainly a war of the nobles. The third estate, either the peasant or the townsman, had taken comparatively little part in it, but they had suffered from it on every hand. Fields were laid waste and villages and even cities destroyed. The cultivator of the soil and the merchant of the town were often put under heavy contributions which were illegal but which they had no means of resisting. The roads were rendered unsafe, trade declined, and even the public markets and fairs were broken up. The robber baron reappeared, and fortifying himself in some castle he had seized, threw off all authority and held the country in terror as far as he could reach. The peasants in despair formed in armed bands to protect themselves, or even appealed to force in a great peasant insurrection—that of the *Croquants* in 1594—as in the worst days of feudalism. Contemporary descriptions of the desolation of the country would seem to carry us back to the beginning of the reign of Charles V., after the great English invasions.

In one respect this whole period of the religious civil wars is characterized by loss—the almost total destruction of the royal authority—a loss which finds a parallel in the English war only during brief intervals and in the very darkest days, in the reign of John or under the mad king, Charles VI. The Huguenot Union and the Catholic League, or, one might say in place of the latter, the absolute power of the Guises—Duke Henry of Guise was called the King of Paris—ruled great portions of France with very little reference to the sovereign and often in open defiance of him. And even in what was left to them the weak and irresolute sons of Henry II. could not maintain their authority—no such authority at least as Louis XII. and Francis I. had exercised. Most characteristic of this condition of things is the resuscitation of the Estates General to bolster up the government. This is the only period of frequent meetings of a national legislature between the fifteenth century and the Revolution, and though the Estates General themselves were powerless to gain anything from the crisis, their pretensions form one of the things with which Henry IV. had to deal at the beginning of his reign.

Decline of the
king's author-
ity.

The Estates
General re-
vived.

But this was not the worst. A real feudal system took long steps toward the reoccupation of all France. The practice had grown up not long before of bestowing governorships of the provinces upon the great nobles of the court, among the offices which reconciled them to the loss of their political independence. Under a strong king they had but little real authority, while they were provided with generous incomes and with the opportunity to make pretense of power and a brilliant display and to hold a little local court of their own when they pleased, in imitation of the king's court. But the

A tendency to establish local independent governments, as in feudal days.

break-down of the central authority converted this pretense of a government into something real, or at least gave the opportunity and the suggestion of such a conversion. In a great number of the provinces, the governors, whether Catholic or Protestant, but especially the



HENRY IV.

leaders of the League, established a rule of their own which was almost or quite as independent as that of the great dukes or counts in the same provinces under Philip Augustus. The process went still further, just as in the original feudal system, and many of the smaller nobles, or commanders of the king's garrisons, set up their own authority over their lands or towns and defied

the governor. Some of those who had taken this position went as far as seriously to discuss the means of rendering permanent the powers they had usurped, and proposed to introduce again liege homage, as the only bond of connection between themselves and the king.

It was then a double task which confronted Henry IV., intent upon the recovery of France. The royal authority, for one thing, must be again established everywhere and the centralization of the state renewed.

The twofold task before Henry IV.

In the second place, but only to be accomplished when the first had been in great measure completed, order must be restored, the farmer and the merchant must be made secure, and France directed once more into the way of prosperity and economic renewal.

The first of these tasks was, in the main, accomplished before the edict of Nantes. As province after province was occupied by Henry in his conquest of the kingdom, it was reduced to order. The smaller nobles were forced to submit; the brigands were punished and the roads made secure; the great nobles, too powerful to be personally punished, their good-will also often necessary to Henry, were bought, often with large sums of money, to surrender the powers they had illegally seized. The duke of Mayenne received three and a half million livres for his hold upon Burgundy, the duke of Mercœur, four million for Brittany. They were both of the family of Guise, and others received as large sums. It is estimated that Henry spent thirty-two million in this way; equal in value to nearly twenty-five million dollars to-day. And it was money well spent to secure the future of France. The nobility showed itself in many ways sullen and discontented so long as Henry reigned. It stood ready to take part in conspiracies against the government or even against the life of the king; but it ruled no more. It fell back into the condition of comparative political insignificance from which it had for a moment emerged.

With the difficulty which the revival of the Estates General made for an absolute king, Henry had less trouble. He never called them together after the kingdom was well in his hands. In their place he adopted the expedient of earlier kings and called an assembly of notables to meet at Rouen in 1596. Its membership

He forces the small nobles to submission,

and buys off the great ones.

Henry represses the Estates General again.

His assembly of notables tries to develop a parliamentary government,

was small, carefully selected, and mainly of the third estate, which the king thought more to be trusted. It contained nine representatives of the clergy, nineteen of the nobles, and fifty-two of the third estate. But even this assembly, so carefully constructed, showed the spirit of reaction against the monarchy which the times had engendered. They would vote revenues to the government for three years only; demanded to be convoked anew at the end of that time; and appointed a permanent *conseil de raison*, as they named it, or committee of accounts, to sit in the interval and take charge of the financial affairs of the state. But this committee found the task too difficult and in a few weeks begged the king to resume control. "Once more," says a recent French historian, "the nation abdicated in favor of the sovereign."

but fails.

The failure was due to the nobles,

and to the lack of training in self-government.

If the third estate had had good leadership, if the nobility had been less selfish, and more willing to join with the third estate in the construction of a common parliamentary government, in the place of planning for a restoration of feudal isolation; above all, if the people of France had had training in constitutional action in the machinery of local government, self-government for and by the nation might have been wrung from the weakness of the sovereign power in this generation. But the crisis passed. Henry had no further trouble from the national legislature, as he did not from the nobles, and the state slipped back easily, under the impulse of his strong rule, into the way of absolutism which it had been following before the interruption of the civil wars.

The economic recovery.

The second task, that of wisely fostering the economic recovery of France, more difficult, from the slender store of acquired knowledge of that day, than the task of reconquest, was certainly more slow. It could not be

accomplished by the sword or by bribes. In it, Henry was faithfully aided by his great minister, the duke of Sully. He did not always approve of the king's policy ; he was less wise and less able than Henry ; and he looked well after his own private fortune ; but managed with great skill the widely varied interests which Henry intrusted to him, and he knew how to submit his judgment to the king's, and even how to make the policy of which he had not approved seem to be his own.



SULLY.

From a silver medal.

To Henry, and to Sully even more, agricultural prosperity seemed to be the foundation of all prosperity, and their efforts were especially directed to protect the peasant. The heaviest burden of the taxes, the *taille* or land tax, rested upon the cultivators, so that the order and economy which were speedily introduced into the national finances were a direct aid to agriculture. The public debt was reduced, interest on the remainder was cut down, expenses were lowered, and as a result the taxes became less and less heavy while the state accumulated a reserve. Inquiry was made into the pretensions of the nobles, and many who had usurped titles and so freed themselves from the *taille* were put back into their proper class. The nobles' right of chase was limited in the interest of the farmer. The introduction of new lines of agriculture, like the culture of the silkworm, and of more scientific methods, was encouraged, and marshes were reclaimed under the patronage of the government. Most enlightened of all was the policy which removed restrictions from the exportation of grain and allowed the cultivator to sell in the best market

Encouragement
of agriculture.Financial
reforms.

which he could find. The result of all these measures was a rapid recovery of agricultural prosperity throughout the kingdom, so great as to attract the attention of contemporary chroniclers.

Manufactures.

Sully was not so much in favor of the encouragement of manufactures as Henry. He thought the mechanic made a poor soldier. The king had a wider view, and he devoted much care to the development of manufactories, especially of articles of luxury, which drew annually large sums of money from France; silk, tapestries, glass, carpets, linen, and metal works of various kinds, all received his favor and prospered.

Commerce.

Commerce, foreign and domestic, received its share of attention. The roads were made secure and easy, and regular means of communication established along the post routes. A great system of canals was planned and the Loire and the Seine were connected. Treaties securing commercial privileges were negotiated with foreign states, and Henry employed with some success the principle of reciprocity against their tariffs and port charges. He protected his merchants from pirates; affirmed that foreign trade was not derogatory to the noble; and attempted, though without success, to organize a French East India Company. His activity reached to the New World, and began the great French colonies there. Port Royal in Acadia was founded in 1605, before the earliest of the English thirteen colonies, and in 1608 Champlain founded Quebec.

Colonies in America.

Prosperity restored.

In ten years there was a new France. Violence and lawlessness had been suppressed. Order and security reigned everywhere. The people were prosperous and growing rich. The taxes were more remunerative and less burdensome. The treasury had an accumulated fund of twenty millions. It is not strange that Henry,

who was by nature and disposition a soldier, should believe that the time had come when France might once more resume the plans for foreign influence and conquest which she had been compelled to lay aside for so long.

The great object of his policy in all parts of Europe—and his diplomacy was active in every capital, as soon as he was on his feet in France, in Italy, in Germany, and in the little states of the Alps, in England, Holland, and Turkey—was to keep in check the House of Hapsburg, whose power he still feared, and if possible to form the other states into a coalition against her. Whether he ever really cherished, as a practicable scheme, the "Great Design," the dream of a great federation of Christian states to maintain the peace and the balance of power of Europe, which Sully describes at length in his memoirs, may well be doubted. Perhaps he looked forward to it as something which the future might realize, or which he would like to bring about if he had the power, and he may have talked such a plan over with his minister in that sense—two most broad-minded men looking on to an ideal state of things, which so practical a man as Henry at least could never really hope to see.

The preponderance of the Austrian dynasty, however, was very real, and the necessity of combining other states together against any extension of its power. If he became a Catholic in France, Henry did not break with the German Protestant states which had been his allies, but he encouraged them in their resistance to Austria and aided them in their plans for growth. Finally, in 1609, a question arose in Germany—the question of the right of succession to the little duchies of Cleves and Juliers in the Rhine Valley—upon which Germany divided into two hostile camps, Catholic or Austrian, and

Henry resumes
the foreign pol-
icy of France

against the
House of
Hapsburg.

Henry's allies
were Protestant
states.

The question of
succession to
Cleves and
Juliers.

Henry intends
to begin war,

when he is as-
sassinated.

Protestant or anti-Austrian. War seemed on the point of breaking out—the war which came shortly and is known as the Thirty Years' War. Henry judged it to be a favorable time for the inevitable struggle. He had three armies in readiness on the frontiers. Mary de Medici was appointed regent in his absence, and had just been crowned that she might act without question, when Henry was stabbed in his carriage in the street and died instantly.

There had been conspiracies in plenty against the life of Henry. The marshall Biron, who had been a general of Henry's and an ambassador abroad, and who had been pardoned for one conspiracy, joined another plot, and was at last beheaded. That the assassin, Ravaillac, had any connection with the malcontents of high rank, or with enemies abroad, who would either of them hardly have hesitated at employing him for the purpose, never has been proved and never disproved. He may well have been one of the believers in the duty of tyrannicide and have been acting for himself alone. The blow of his knife threw the nation back into a new time of disorder, but happily one of shorter duration than that from which the murdered king had rescued her.

Louis XIII.,
1610-1643.

Mary de
Medici.

Louis XIII. was less than ten years old. His mother, Mary de Medici, who became regent, was a foreigner who had had no share in public affairs while Henry lived and had no party devoted to her in the state. She was ambitious of power, but she had no political ability, she was always under the influence of favorites whom she could not control, and she believed that everything was to be accomplished by intrigue and bribery.

Effect of the
death of Henry
IV.

The good order which Henry had established in the state was his personal work and it needed his personal genius to sustain it. Twelve years was not time enough

to overcome the habits of disobedience and anarchy which the civil wars had formed in the characters of the great nobles. They were kept under so long as strong compulsion was exercised over them, but when it was removed they at once reasserted themselves. The country relapsed immediately on the death of Henry into a condition closely resembling its condition in the reign of Henry III. There

Renewed disorder.

were, however, some suggestive differences. The third estate, country or townspeople, could scarcely be induced to take the slightest interest in the strifes of this time. They stood aloof from all parties and contrived to retain something of the prosperity which they had lately secured. Another difference was that the rebellions of the nobles and of the Huguenots were hardly seriously meant in this period.



MARY DE MEDICI.

Born in Florence in 1574, of the younger branch of the family, and only distantly related to Catherine de Medici. Died in Cologne, 1642.

They were appeals to arms, not really with the intention of securing political independence and dividing France once more into little states, but merely in order to force the government to buy them off, either with money outright or with new privileges. It was a way of drawing a pistol on the state

Utter selfishness of the nobles.

with the order to stand and deliver. Mary de Medici thought it the easiest way to secure peace to respond to their demands, which naturally had the effect of making them larger on the next occasion, and the vast sums of which Condé and his fellow brigands plundered the state more than exhausted the reserves which Henry and Sully had accumulated.

Five of these civil wars are counted during the minority of Louis XIII., or rather before the advent of Richelieu, but the only one of them worthy of any attention or which had anything better than sordid motives behind it, was the revolt of the Huguenots in 1620. This began upon the attempt of the king to establish liberty of worship for the Catholics in Béarn, according to a promise which his father had made to the pope. The Protestant party professed to see in this an attack upon their liberties as a whole, and to fear the violation of the edict of Nantes. Their organization gave them almost the position of an independent nation and they attempted to strengthen themselves with foreign alliances. If they had been successful in the war their conditions of peace would undoubtedly have been the practical separation of France into two independent states. But they were not successful. They lost many towns to the king; the higher Protestant nobles showed themselves as ready to be bought off as their Catholic peers; and at the close of the war, in 1623, the Huguenots were able to retain independent control of only two of their great fortresses, La Rochelle and Montauban.

Since the reign of Louis XI., the Estates General of France had been called together, as we have seen, only in times of public confusion and of weakness on the part of the government. It was to be expected that they would meet again during this period. In the first civil

A Huguenot war.

The unity of France threatened.

The Huguenots fail.

A fitting time for the revival of the Estates General.

war Condé had demanded that they should be called together, not from any desire to have them meet, but merely because the demand would embarrass the government. The regent promised that a meeting should be held, and in 1614 they met, but they did nothing.

They showed themselves, in fact, entirely incapable of political action.

The three estates could come to no agreement with one another. The first and second were intent only on their own selfish interests, and the third, which alone showed itself seriously disposed to do business, was treated by the other two with the most open and supreme contempt,

and could not protect itself. The chief result of the meeting was to bring the institution into discredit, and the Estates never came together again until the eventful meeting of 1789.

While Mary de Medici was regent the government was really in the hands of her favorites, Leonora Galigai and her husband Concini. They used their opportunity to enrich themselves shamelessly, and excited general hatred by the insolence of their behavior, but they maintained themselves in power until the favorites of the

Their last
meeting before
1789.



LOUIS XIII.

Government
by favorites.

young king persuaded him to allow them to act. Their fall was then sudden and complete and carried with it that of the queen mother. But it was not the end of government by favorites. Louis XIII. was no more able to be master of the situation than was Mary de Medici, and the place of Concini was taken by Charles d'Albert de Luynes, who had learned how to keep the king amused. He was not a better man than Concini, but he had somewhat more patriotic views, though he had no opportunity to carry them out.

The rise of
Richelieu.

But during these years, the man who was to be the greatest statesman of the age and one of the greatest of French ministers, who was to give to Louis XIII. the single glory of his reign which he himself deserved, that of keeping his minister steadily in power as long as he lived in spite of all cabals and intrigues—this man was preparing his way for high office in the state and making his first experiments in government.

The early steps
in his career.

Richelieu was born in 1589 of a noble family in Poitou, and at the death of Henry IV. he had lately taken possession of the family bishopric of Luçon. He first attracted public attention as a speaker for the clergy in the Estates General of 1614 and soon passed into the service of the queen mother and shared her ups and downs of fortune for the next ten years. After the death of De Luynes, which occurred near the close of the war with the Protestants, the king became reconciled with his mother, and the renewal of her influence over her son was soon followed by the transfer of Richelieu to the king's service. His control of public affairs is dated from 1624, and continues nearly twenty years, till his death in 1643. He never was a personal favorite with Louis XIII., but the wide reach of his genius, the wisdom of his plans, and the clearness with which he made

See Perkins's
"France Under
Richelieu and
Mazarin."

Enters the
king's service.

the king comprehend them, carried and held the judgment of Louis in his favor.

When Richelieu became the first minister, he found marked out by the circumstances before him two distinct lines of action, either exacting enough for all the abilities of a man of genius, and so pressing for decision, both of them, that some policy in regard to each must be adopted; and so closely interwoven, in the probable results of any policy, that they could scarcely be separated. These were: the action demanded by the internal condition of the country and the government, and the opportunity or the necessity for an active foreign policy presented by the Thirty Years' War, which had begun in Germany.

Richelieu's
genius de-
manded in two
directions.

The peace of Augsburg, which closed the first of the religious civil wars in Germany in 1555, had recognized the right of the two religions to a legal existence in the Empire and had given to the government of each state the power of determining what the religion of its subjects should be. It was intended to be a perpetual peace. But experience soon found opportunities under it for action on either side which the other thought to be unjust and in violation of its intention. Other causes of quarrel, of a more political nature, were not lacking. The House of Austria was jealously watched even by the small states of Germany, lest their independence should be lost. Her plans, especially, for establishing a continuous line of communication between her possessions in the Low Countries and in Italy excited apprehension. For ten years before 1618 peace had been kept only with difficulty, or indeed may hardly be said to have existed. A great war was just on the point of beginning in 1610 and was averted only by the sudden death of Henry IV. Finally troubles between the

Causes of the
Thirty Years'
War.

Catholics and Protestants in Bohemia led to civil war in that country, from which a general war was gradually kindled, involving the two parties throughout the Empire.

The opportunity for France.



RICHELIEU.

This was the situation of foreign affairs with which Richelieu had to deal. It was an opportunity to join with strong allies against the House of Hapsburg, to put an end to her plans of aggrandizement, perhaps even to cripple her to such an extent that she would be no longer to be feared, and if this should be successfully done France could hardly fail to gain some extension of territory for herself in the

process, perhaps even be able to reach her "natural frontier," the Rhine.

The first step must be to strengthen the government at home.

Richelieu was clear headed enough to see, however, that if the united Spanish and Austrian states had many enemies, they had also large reserves of strength and many friends. If France was to engage openly in this war with any sound hope of great successes, it must be a consolidated and united France, able to put forth all its strength, such as Henry IV. had had behind him when

he determined upon war. The policy then which must have the precedence was the policy of restoring the government to the power and efficiency which it had lost during the king's minority. The foreign policy for the present must be one of waiting, of diplomacy, of encouraging the enemies of Austria, and of making new ones for her, not one of active intervention. Richelieu was ready, however, to run great risk of war if the occasion demanded, or the enemy were about to gain such a decided advantage as would have accrued to them, for instance, by the occupation of the Valtelline passes in completing their line of communication between the Mediterranean Sea and the mouth of the Rhine.

Objects of Richelieu's diplomacy.

That these enemies of Austria whom he supported, and who made gains of territory and of influence with his assistance, were almost all Protestant states did not trouble Richelieu. He was a good Catholic and a good churchman, but he was first of all a statesman. He seems to have realized the fact that there could be no longer any hope of overthrowing protestantism, and that in all future combinations permanent Protestant states must be reckoned with. First of all statesmen since the Reformation, with the possible exception of Henry IV.—who stood, however, on a different plane but of whose policy Richelieu was really the heir—he allowed the question of religion as such no weight in his plans, but kept steadily in view the advantage of the state.

Richelieu disregards religious differences in his diplomacy.

In solving the problem of the restoration of authority to the government in internal as well as in foreign affairs, Richelieu was the successor of Henry IV. But in dealing with the first difficulty which confronted him, the semi-independent state which the Huguenots had formed, he was able to go farther than Henry would have felt warranted in going.

Richelieu and the Huguenots.

Huguenot independence dangerous to France.

The siege of La Rochelle.

The Huguenot independence destroyed, but their religious liberty confirmed.

Richelieu was taught very early in his ministry, by the Huguenot outbreak of 1625, while he was in the midst of the difficulties of the Valtelline question, how great was the danger which the military and political independence, still remaining to the Protestants in France, presented at any crisis in the development of a foreign policy. This revolt was put down without difficulty, and Richelieu bided his time, resolved that this enemy in the rear should be rendered powerless at the first favorable opportunity. It came in 1627, and in spite of the assistance which England attempted to render the Huguenots they were completely subdued. Richelieu's long siege of La Rochelle, lasting nearly fifteen months, in which he undertook the seemingly impossible task of closing its harbor with a mole of stonework, shows his tremendous resolution, determined not to be cheated of the result on which he had set his mind, whatever effort it might require.

The Huguenots once subdued, Richelieu's treatment of them made clear his statesmanship. The edict of Alais, called also the "edict of Grace," deprived them of their political privileges. Their independent fortresses were all given up to the king. Their political assemblies—their state within the state—were at an end. But all the religious privileges secured to them by the edict of Nantes were confirmed. They retained their religion and worship unmolested; the offices of the state were still open to them, and their representatives retained their seats in the judicial tribunals. It was not protestantism upon which Richelieu made war. It was upon the danger to France, the serious weakness in the face of a foreign enemy, which the Huguenot independence and factious spirit caused, and to overcome this Richelieu saw that religious toleration must be granted, while political in-

dependence was destroyed. The honest Huguenot retained all that he would have been willing to protect with his life, while the factious and turbulent Huguenot was deprived of the means of embarrassing the government.

Richelieu's various contests with the nobles during his long ministry are often represented as if they were the last struggle of the royal power with feudalism, and as if Richelieu had completed the work begun by Louis VI. and Philip II. In one sense Richelieu did complete the work of the earlier Capetian kings, in putting the finishing touches to the absolutism which they founded. But he was carrying on the work of St. Louis rather than that of Louis the Fat. There was now no feudalism left in France of the sort that had been so serious a menace to the king's authority in the time of Philip Augustus. For more than a hundred years, the king had always been undisputed master when he was personally a man who could be master. They were nobles with whom Richelieu had to deal, not feudal barons. The object which they sought in their conspiracies against him was not the overthrow of the king's authority or the reëstablishment of their own independence. It was to overthrow the minister that some one of them might take his place and exercise the absolute power of the king as he did.

Richelieu's relation to the formation of French absolutism.

The purpose of the nobles in opposition to Richelieu.

Richelieu treated those who attempted to bring about his downfall as traitors to the state, and, judged in view of the form which the historical growth of France had taken, he was right. The policy of Richelieu represented the organic continuation of that growth. The triumph of the nobles would have been, not the reëstablishment of the feudal system, but the return of the weakness, and divisions, and oppression which had been characteristic of that system. It would have been another long delay

The "Day of
Dupes," 1630.

in the advance of France to supremacy in Europe. Richelieu's sudden triumph on the famous "Day of Dupes," when his enemies appeared so certainly to have succeeded that he had already prepared the means of flight, was probably due to the clearness with which



COSTUME OF THE END OF THE REIGN OF LOUIS XIII.

Louis XIII. realized this fact. The greatest work of Richelieu in the completion of the absolute monarchy was to make it the habit of the French people so that from this time, if one may say so, it runs itself. That is what it does after Louis XIV. takes the government into his own hands, and thenceforward until the Revolution.

It was also the work of Richelieu to perfect in a number of details the machinery by which this absolute government was carried on, and to do away with, or at least to destroy, the independence of such institutions as still remained from the times of a less arbitrary government.

Government
machinery
perfected.

The most important of these older institutions still remaining was the Parlement of Paris, called by preëminence the Parlement—the supreme court of France. It was strictly a judicial tribunal, but as, one by one, the other institutions which had existed beside the monarchy and given some expression to another will in the state than the king's disappeared, the Parlement had gradually developed some of its early functions into something of a legislative character, capable at least of acting as a slight check upon the otherwise unlimited royal will.

The Parlement
of Paris,

Its chief action in this direction was an outgrowth of its right of registering the royal edicts. The Parlement kept the official register of the laws. The last resort which any one could have in enforcing his rights under any law was to the Parlement of Paris. If the Parlement thus appealed to failed to find the law in question in the register, no rights under it could be enforced. There was no such law. By refusing, then, to register an edict which the king had issued, the Parlement exercised a veto power over the royal legislation. The tendency to a real absolutism, however, was so powerful in France that such a decided flaw in it as this was not likely to be tolerated, and strong kings, for many generations before Richelieu, had found a way around it. The king exercised the right, which had been the duty of earlier kings, and which the French kings had never abandoned, although the English kings had, to attend in person a session of their court. This was called "holding a bed of justice." The king, attended by some of the great lords, occupied the royal seat, called the "bed of justice," whence the name for the ceremony, ordered the register to be brought before him and had the edict inscribed in his presence.

as a check
upon the king's
absolute power.

The right of
registration.

A "bed of
justice."

Richelieu took very decided ground against the ex-

Richelieu destroys the value of this right of Parlement.

ercise of the right of registration by Parlement at all. He asserted that its functions were purely judicial ; that it derived all its powers from the king, and had no right to set up its opinion against the royal will. But while Richelieu's action undoubtedly reduced this practice of Parlement to a nullity under strong kings, like Louis XIV., and destroyed all chance of its growing into a really constitutional check, it did not so completely destroy it but that it reappeared under a weak government, as in the minority of Louis XIV., or when public opinion was strongly opposed to the policy of the government, as at times in the reign of Louis XV.

Richelieu and the state machinery.

Richelieu deprived the noble governors of provinces of the last relics of real power, leaving them nothing but mere display. He abolished the offices of constable of France and of grand admiral, which seemed to him too powerful to be held by subjects. He regulated and developed the system of executive ministers, or secretaries of state, and of royal councils to advise the king and direct the execution of his will. He introduced new agents of the royal power, called "intendants," whose functions were like those of the *enquêteurs* of St. Louis, to keep the local officers to their duties, and to see that the laws were faithfully executed. Under Richelieu appeared the first French newspaper, the *Gazette of France*. It was a weekly of from eight to twelve quarto pages. Richelieu held it under complete control and supplied it with both news and opinions. He also showed the way to a government control of literature, which Louis XIV. carried so far.

Intendants.

The first French newspaper.

France in the Thirty Years' War.

It was in 1635 that Richelieu, after having by his diplomacy and his gold supported the Protestants in Germany, aided in the fall of Wallenstein, and brought into the struggle the armies and the military genius of

Gustavus Adolphus, judged that the time had come for the active intervention of a French army in the Thirty Years' War. In the war which followed, the French gained no brilliant success, and the contest seemed to be going quite as often against them as in their favor. It lasted during the rest of Richelieu's life, the chief results being the occupation of Alsace and the desolation of new portions of Germany.

Richelieu is one of the world's great ministers. But to judge him rightly he must be judged in view of the fact which was the great source of his strength, that he worked in the direction already marked out by the long development of the French nation—a development which he completed and rendered secure.

Richelieu's great work was possible because he worked in the line of the historical growth of France.

CHAPTER XIII.

LOUIS XIV.

Louis XIV.,
1643-1715.

See Hassall
"Louis XIV."

Cardinal Maza-
rin in power.

He continues
the policy of
Richelieu.

RICHELIEU died in December, 1642. Louis XIII. died in the following May, leaving his son, Louis, in his fifth year. The wife of Louis XIII., daughter of Philip III. of Spain and called in French history Anne of Austria, had been the enemy of Richelieu and had never had the full confidence of her husband, and on his death, though he appointed her regent, he placed the final decision of all important questions in the hands of a council. This restriction the regent was unwilling to allow and she appealed to the Parlement to be relieved of it. The Parlement, glad of an opportunity to reassert its right of vetoing the royal edicts, granted her request, and she became regent with full powers. But she did not reverse the policy of Richelieu. To the surprise of every one, the minister, in whose hands she lodged the real power, was the Italian, Cardinal Mazarin, who had had his training under Richelieu during the last years of his life, and who had been carrying on his plans between the death of Richelieu and that of the king.

Mazarin was perhaps not gifted with the profound statesmanship of Richelieu, and he did not originate the policy which he pursued, but he deserves to rank for his own abilities among the great ministers of history, and he was undoubtedly personally devoted to the purposes which he had inherited from his greater predecessor, the humiliation of the House of Austria and the protection of the king's authority. But he was in character and

methods a great contrast to Richelieu. His methods, like himself, were Italian. He trusted more to intrigue and tried to win by yielding and by bribery where Richelieu would have struck square blows. His ministry must be judged, also, by the fact that he had no king to sustain him as Richelieu had, and that the regent, who stood for the king, was a woman and a Spaniard. It was natural that the French should have less confidence in the ultimate purposes of two foreigners, one of them a daughter of their enemies, than in those of a Frenchman of noble birth.

The situation was the signal for all the discontented elements in the state to try to undo the work of Richelieu, and for the last attempt, until the great Revolution, to modify the royal absolutism. The civil war which followed, which was called the war of the *Fronde* —a nickname derived from a game of the street boys of Paris which embodies a popular judgment of the frivolous character of the war—brings together, in its successive stages, three different elements against the regent and her minister. Each of these parties takes the name of *Fronde*, and the suc-

But by different methods.



A reaction against Richelieu's work.

CARDINAL MAZARIN.

Born in the kingdom of Naples, July 14, 1602; died March 9, 1661.

The Fronde.

Its three
stages.

cessive stages of the war are sometimes designated by the same name. These are : the first, or parliamentary Fronde, in which the leading issue was that raised by the Parlement ; the second, or princely Fronde, whose leaders were the princes of the blood and the great nobles, even more selfish in their objects than during the minority of Louis XIII. ; and the third, or popular Fronde, the democratic element in Paris and the great cities.

Demands of the
Parlement.

It was the first of these only which had serious or constitutional objects in view. The Parlement demanded that henceforth no tax should be levied to which they had not granted their consent by registering the edict, free from all compulsion by the king. They demanded also that no Frenchman, of whatever degree, should be arrested and imprisoned for more than twenty-four hours without examination, striking thus at one of the methods which Richelieu had employed in the punishment of his enemies which was an invasion of their rights. A third demand was that Richelieu's system of intendants should be abandoned. These points Mazarin and the queen were compelled to concede in October, 1648, but before six months they found themselves strong enough to withdraw all they had granted, except in regard to the intendants.


The later
Fronde more
selfish.

The war as it passes into its later stages becomes more and more a purely selfish and frivolous affair. The Parlement withdraws from it, and it has no serious objects, but it is none the less a real danger at times. The queen and Mazarin more than once are obliged to flee from Paris ; Mazarin at last withdraws from France. The two great generals, Condé and Turenne, fight first on one side and then on the other, but opposed to one another.

Finally Condé was defeated and the royal cause

decisively triumphed. Condé was forced to go over to the Spaniards, who had been aiding him in the last stage of the war; the Parlement was forbidden to give any attention to political or financial affairs; Paris was disarmed and lost the right of electing its own municipal officers; and the system of intendants was restored.

Triumph of
Mazarin.



BARRICADE OF THE TIME OF THE FRONDE.

The war left the royal authority where Richelieu had placed it, except that an unsuccessful attempt to destroy it naturally made it stronger.

Meantime the Thirty Years' War had closed with the treaty of Westphalia. In its last years the genius of Turenne and of Condé had gained many successes for the French arms, and arms and diplomacy had deprived Austria of some of her allies. France was in a position to demand favorable terms. Alsace was ceded to her in full sovereignty. The two fortresses of Breisach and Philippsburg, on the upper Rhine, were to be French.

End of the
Thirty Years'
War, 1648.

France reaches
the Rhine.

All the Austrian fortresses in the same part of the river were dismantled ; Strasburg, a free city of the Empire, was the only one left not French. This put the whole upper Rhine under French control, and as some of the territories in the middle Rhine were decidedly under French influence, the river almost ceased to be German and became French.

France gains
much more
than territory.

This was the territorial gain of France from the peace of Westphalia. But the other advantages which she acquired, in the fatal weakening of her great rival of the last hundred years, and in the foundation of her own predominant influence in Europe, were far more considerable. The Hapsburg possessions in the Netherlands were cut off, by the position of France in the Rhine Valley, from their old line of connection with the other Hapsburg lands. The Empire was virtually destroyed, for though the name and title with some shadowy rights remained, the separate states were made virtually sovereign with the right to make treaties of their own with foreign states. Austria and Spain were separated, for Spain thought it wise to go on with the war with France, hoping to gain something from the opposition which was beginning to be dangerous to Mazarin. The two countries remembered the bond of family between them so long as it lasted, but they were never again so closely identified in policy as before 1648. Still more important, perhaps, as rendering possible the operations of Louis XIV., the successful intervention of France in the internal affairs of Germany, and her full protection of her allies, led the German states to look to her, as much or even more than to Austria, as a kind of head German power, able to give the favored ones success in their rivalries with one another, and that decisive and shameful influence of the French language and

She becomes
a German
power.

literature, manners and morals, began in Germany which continued so long.

The war with Spain went on for nearly twelve years longer, but Spain found herself deceived in the hopes with which she had continued it. In spite of the genius of Condé, which, after the defeat of the Fronde, was placed entirely at her service, events went in the main steadily against her. England, which was just beginning, under the vigorous government of Cromwell, to cherish definite plans of commercial and colonial empire, and which saw in Spain her first dangerous rival to be humbled, entered into alliance with France against her. Condé's siege of Arras failed ; Turenne gained the battle of the Dunes ; Gravelines and Dunkirk were captured, and the latter turned over to the English, who hoped to make another Calais of it ; Cromwell seized Jamaica and burned the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Cadiz, and finally Spain was ready for peace.

Continued war
with Spain.

England aids
France.

The peace of the Pyrenees looked to the future supremacy of France even more than the peace of Westphalia. A few small territories still held by Spain north of the Pyrenees, remains of the feudal possessions of the kings of Aragon, were ceded to France and a narrow ribbon of land from the western borders of the Spanish Netherlands, and in the neighborhood of Lorraine. Lorraine was not ceded to France but, because the duke refused to accept the conditions on which it was to be restored to him, it was held in possession by the French. The League of the Rhine, which was formed between France, Sweden, and a number of the German states to compel the emperor to keep the terms of the peace of Westphalia, greatly strengthened the leadership of France in central Europe.

The peace of
the Pyrenees,
1659.

But Mazarin's heart was chiefly set on the conditions

Plans for the marriage of Louis XIV.

Looking to the union of Spain with France.

Mazarin sets a trap for the Spanish minister.

It leads to the War of the Spanish Succession.

Close of Mazarin's ministry.

attached to the marriage of Louis XIV. with his cousin, Maria Theresa, the eldest daughter of Philip IV., of Spain. The Salic Law was not recognized in the Spanish kingdoms, and the crown might be carried by an heiress to her husband. Mazarin's ambition for France already cherished the hope of absorbing the Spanish Kingdom and its colonies in a Bourbon empire as it had once been in a Hapsburg. Philip IV. had two sons, but they were in feeble health—the stamina of the Spanish Hapsburgs had declined with the declining strength of the nation. The prospect of a French succession might not be a distant one. If Mazarin saw the opportunity, the Spanish were equally alive to it, and insisted upon a complete renunciation by the young princess of all her rights of succession. Mazarin could not bring them to abandon this stipulation, but he keenly suspected the exhausted financial condition of Spain, and he agreed to the renunciation in consideration of the payment of a large dower in money. If the payments were not made at the specified dates, the renunciation was to be void. As Mazarin had suspected, Spain was not able to make the payments promptly, and Mazarin could congratulate himself on his greatest diplomatic success, preparing the way, as he thought, for the widest extension of the power of France. In reality he had prepared the way for the great disasters which closed the reign of Louis XIV.

Mazarin lived but two years after the peace of the Pyrenees, and they were years devoid of great events. He had the satisfaction, which Richelieu had missed, of seeing his purposes all accomplished ; the king at home without a check on his arbitrary will ; France abroad just taking her place as the greatest power of Europe. These two ministries in succession, Richelieu's and

Mazarin's, had forced the greatest enemy of France, her hereditary rival during nearly two hundred years, into a position of almost acknowledged inferiority.

The House of Hapsburg humbled.

When Mazarin died, in March, 1661, Louis XIV. announced that he should be, henceforth, his own prime minister, all business should pass through his hands, and all questions be decided directly by himself. Every one expected that he would soon tire of the drudgery which he thus imposed upon himself, but he kept it up until the end of his life.

Louis XIV. his own prime minister.

The reign of Louis XIV. occupies a great place in the popular conception of the history of France. His name stands beside that of Napoleon I., as marking an age when France was supreme in Europe, and threatened with her plans of enlargement the safety and independence of all her neighbors, and even seemed to be reaching forward to the headship of the world. And this estimate of Louis's reign is in part deserved. The brilliant surface appearance which was maintained until the end; the great and real successes of its earlier years; the still vaster projects of its later years; the tremendous power all concentrated in a single hand; the fear which the plans of Louis excited throughout all Europe and the coalitions which were formed against them; the place which the reign has always held in literature—all these seem to assign to Louis the position of the one "grand monarche."

The "grand monarche."

But despite all its real and not inconsiderable successes the reign was, in the larger sight of history, a reign of deceiving ambitions and profound failure. The real struggle for the supremacy of the world was not to be fought out in Europe, and for the slight and temporary gains which Louis made upon that continent, he deliberately threw away the opportunity to forestall upon

Louis's efforts misdirected.

two others the only rival France could have to fear in that struggle, and he left his country at the close of his reign about to enter, exhausted and crippled, upon the first, which proved to be the decisive, stages of the conflict. In the first steps of his ambition he laughed at the warning of Spain that England was growing too strong; at the end he saw his most cherished plans frustrated by the determination and resources of the de-spised state.

He was following, however, the traditional policy of France.

Louis's reign is the time when France was turned into the channel of inevitable failure in the conflict with England, but Louis is not to be held personally responsible for the mistake of policy which he made. It would have required more than the keen foresight of Henry IV., or of Richelieu, to have read the future aright in 1661, with Charles I. on the throne of England. The line of French development in its foreign policy had been clearly marked out and constantly followed since the end of the fifteenth century. The channels in which it was running were now cut broad and deep, and to have thrown the foreign policy of the nation into new channels would have required not merely extraordinary ability to read the future, but extraordinary abilities of every sort. And Louis XIV. was only an ordinary man. His one great talent was his capacity of drudgery, his fidelity to the laborious details of his office, the industry with which he worked at "the trade of a king," as he called it. He could follow with persistent energy the traditional policy which had been handed down to him, but he originated nothing. And it must, also, be remembered that it is hardly too much to say that if any French minister of that time could have foreseen the possibility of England's occupying the position which she actually

Louis XIV. was not a great man.

reached in 1763, and could have so shaped the foreign policy of France as to have put France there in place of England, he would have won for himself the fame of the greatest statesman of the world's history.

The reign of Louis XIV. presents two sides which may well be kept, to a considerable extent, separate from one another in our study of the age : the foreign side, the wars of Louis and his plans of conquest ; and the internal history of France, the absolutism of the king, and the financial and economic condition and changes.

The two sides
of Louis's
reign.

The first problem which confronted Louis when he assumed the government was a financial one. The finances of the state were in extreme confusion. The work which Sully had done under Henry IV. had been long ago undone, and no effort had since been made to restore order. The weakest part of Richelieu's ministry had been his administration of the finances. He made no effort to relieve the burdens of the people. Indeed, he expressed his belief that the peasant, like the mule, worked most contentedly when he was heavily burdened. Mazarin had made matters still worse, and had connived at abuses in the collection and expenditure of the revenue from which he had profited himself and by means of which he had collected his great fortune.

The financial
condition in
1661.

But the dishonesty of the king's agents was not the only serious trouble. Two others were equally grave. On one side the method of collection was extremely faulty. The taxes were farmed, and the purchaser of the right of collection paid naturally as little as possible to the state and extorted from the people even more than the law allowed him. With a corrupt financial administration the abuses in both these directions could be carried to extremes. On another side the credit of

The taxes
farmed out.

The state's
credit.

Sale of public
offices.

The punish-
ment of
Fouquet.

Colbert.

the state was very low. It could borrow money only at extravagant rates, twenty-five per cent or more. It seems to us an absurd method of raising money to sell the right to the salaried offices of the state—even the hereditary right to them—and especially to create new and unnecessary offices for the sake of selling them. And yet the evidence seems to indicate that the money which was raised by the sale of these offices cost the state less, in the seventeenth century at least, than the loans which it made or the annuities which it sold. On this side also corruption helped to increase the difficulties of the government. Fraudulent certificates of indebtedness never incurred, or for amounts largely increased above the true amount of the debt, were freely multiplied.

The first step in introducing reforms must be to get rid of Mazarin's superintendent of the finances, Fouquet, who was the personification of these abuses. He was able from his speculations to indulge in a greater extravagance of luxury than the king even. Louis had him suddenly arrested, while he believed that he still enjoyed the full favor of the king, and when the court which tried him sentenced him to banishment, Louis by an exercise of his arbitrary power, which could override even a judicial sentence, changed his punishment to perpetual imprisonment. The king never released him and he endured his punishment for sixteen years.

The control of the finances was taken by Colbert, the greatest of Louis XIV.'s ministers and one of the most famous financial ministers of French history. He was the son of a merchant and had attracted the attention of Mazarin, who had put him in charge of his own private fortune. The order which Colbert brought about in Mazarin's disordered estate convinced him of his great

financial talents and of his ability to serve the state. Probably Mazarin did not use the famous words which have been ascribed to him in recommending Colbert to Louis on his death-bed : " I owe all that I have to your majesty and I repay it all in giving you Colbert." But he certainly did recommend Louis to employ Colbert in his service, and the king followed the advice.

When Colbert had once obtained control, he employed all his great talents in enforcing the most rigorous reforms. Every abuse was attacked. Fraudulent certificates of indebtedness were canceled; others were reduced in amount; rates of interest were lowered; the taxes were farmed out on much better terms and their collection made less oppressive.

Former farmers of the revenue who had acquired vast fortunes were required to prove the honesty of their gains or surrender them to the state. Considerable sums were recovered in this way. The especially burdensome tax of the *taille* was reduced in amount. The indirect taxes were looked after and their productiveness increased. The revolution wrought by Colbert's reforms can be partially measured by the fact that in less than ten years, while



His reforms.

COLBERT.

Born in Rheims, August 29, 1619. Died in Paris, September 6, 1683.

Especially in taxation.

He more than doubles the revenue.

the payments made by the people had been increased less than fifteen per cent, the net revenue of the state had increased 125 per cent. Had it not been for the cost of Louis's foreign wars, and the unbridled extravagance of his court, French finances would soon have passed into the condition of the most prosperous modern state. But even the genius of Colbert could not keep pace with such expenses, and at his death the burden upon the people was as heavy and the extremity of the state almost as great as when he took office.

Colbert and the protective system.

But Colbert is as famous for another branch of financial administration as for his revenue reforms ; for his development of a theory of government assistance to industry which is still called by his name in the French language, Colbertism. But Colbert was not the originator of the protective theory. That was one which had come down to him from a time when commercial experience was limited and its facts not carefully studied. To Colbert the fundamental fact seemed to be that the profit made by a foreigner who sold goods in France was a dead loss to the kingdom, and consequently the exportation of gold to settle the balance of trade drained the resources of the country. To make the nation truly prosperous the foreigner must be prevented from selling goods in France, so far as possible; and everything that could be must be made at home to keep the money in the country. To obtain this result tariffs, bounties, and monopolies were employed, new industries were introduced and foreign workmen imported, and methods of work and quality of product carefully regulated by paternal edicts. The results, however, were disappointing. After the system of Colbert had been in use for thirty years, deputies from the chief cities of France meeting in convention to discuss measures for the improvement of business, gave

On the effect of Colbert's system see Perkins's "France under the Regency," Chap. IV.

evidence as to the depressed condition of trade and industry in all lines. Unfavorable conditions of many kinds had no doubt concurred to produce the unsatisfactory state of things. But certainly the system of Colbert had not proved protective in the sense intended. In many cases the deputies traced the evils complained of directly to it.

Colbert united in his hands the care of many departments which would be separated in modern ministries, and he sought the advantage of France in many directions. He took great pains to develop the royal navy and a mercantile marine. Companies for foreign trade were organized with monopolies, after the fashion of the time, for

the West Indies and the East Indies, Senegal and Madagascar. Colonies were carefully fostered, as Colbert thought, but under the most minute paternal regulations, which entirely destroyed the freedom of action necessary to the success of a colony. The interior trade of France was also cared for, some tolls were abolished,

It had not accomplished all that was hoped.



GOBELIN TAPESTRY. Time of Louis XIV.

Efforts of Colbert in other directions.

See Parkman's
"The Old
Régime in
Canada."

and the system of canals which Sully had planned was carried still further.

Colbert's failure to reform the finances was due to Louis.

But Colbert could not meet the increasing demands of Louis's wars and of his court. His only resource was to increase the burdens of taxation which he had begun by lightening, and he died at last, in 1683, his plans nearly all defeated and himself so bitterly hated by the people he had faithfully served, that his coffin had to be guarded from the mob by a detachment of soldiers.

Louis's four wars.

The wars of Louis XIV. are four in number. First for the conquest of the Spanish Netherlands, closed in 1668 by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; second against the Dutch Republic, closed in 1678 by the peace of Nymwegen; the third against a coalition of European states following the Revolution of 1688 in England, closing with the peace of Ryswick in 1697; and finally the War of the Spanish Succession, which continues almost to the end of Louis's reign and is closed by the peace of Utrecht in 1713.

Known as the "right of devolution."

Philip IV., of Spain, died in 1665, but the plan which Mazarin had formed for the absorption of Spain in the French monarchy could not be carried out at that time. By a second marriage Philip left a young son, Charles II., to succeed him. But Louis could not allow to pass the opportunity which the weakness of Spain presented. He discovered an old custom in certain of the Spanish Netherlands, relating to private estates, by which the lands of the father passed on his death to the children of a first wife to the exclusion of those of a second. Louis demanded that this should be recognized as a public law and advanced the claim of his wife under it, to succeed her father in the Netherlands. Louis had then a magnificent army and navy and a full treasury, and as Spain would not acknowledge the rights of his wife, he

invaded the disputed territories in the spring of 1667 and in two months had taken possession of all the southern portion of the country. Louis offered moderate terms of peace, but Spain was not disposed to accept them. Then England, Holland, and Sweden formed a Triple Alliance to compel peace. Louis's answer was as rapid an occupation of the Spanish province of Franche-Comté as had been his occupation of the southern Netherlands. Spain then yielded to the pressure and ceded to Louis by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle the portion of the Netherlands which he had occupied.

The Triple Alliance.

Louis closed this war with one fixed determination, that of crushing, at the first favorable moment, the little Dutch Republic, which had presumed, a nation of traders and fishermen, to set limits to the conquests of the "great monarch." If those conquests were to be carried out, as Louis was determined they should be, the opposition of Holland must be overcome. Louis's pride was deeply hurt also by the rejoicings in Holland at the success of their intervention, and by the somewhat extravagant language of which they made use in speaking of himself. His first step was to deprive the Dutch of all allies, by his diplomacy, and leave them standing alone exposed to his anger. His most difficult task in carrying out this plan was to detach the English from the Dutch alliance and secure their aid himself. For England still hated and feared catholicism; distrusted the religious and political plans of the Stuarts; and was alarmed at the prospect of a union with the greatest Catholic power against the Protestant Dutch. But the selfish wishes of Charles II. fell in with those of Louis, and he was easily secured by pensions and promises.

Reasons for Louis's war with Holland.

Holland isolated.

In the war which followed Charles was, however,

The war serves
England's
interests,

following the policy which the commercial interests of England had dictated for half a century past, and the English people were not without a consciousness of the fact. Spain had been the first great rival of England upon the seas, and her constant enemy for nearly a hundred years. In the last war, which revealed the fall of Spain and left her no longer to be feared, England had struck hard blows on the side of France. For the



LOUIS DE BOURBON, THE GREAT CONDÉ.
Born September 8, 1621. Died December 11, 1686.

and is opposed
to the wider
interests of
France.

past fifty years a contest of the same sort had been going on with her second rival, Holland—a contest which the governments at home had not been able to prevent their merchants and colonists from carrying to the point of bloodshed and massacre even in time of peace. On the other hand, this war was the first serious mistake of policy committed by Louis. It was not merely that he was making war upon the hereditary ally of France almost since the beginning of the struggle with Spain. He was, also, making war upon the ally whose aid might have been of the greatest service to France in a coming struggle far more desperate than that with Spain. If Louis could have foreseen the events of the

eighteenth century, he would have desired above all things to preserve the alliance with Holland, and to have secured for France the services of her fleets and her resources. Holland was to give her aid to France at times during that century, but it was a Holland crippled and exhausted, largely by this very war upon which Louis now entered.

The war itself was somewhat like the preceding. It opened with rapid successes for the French, followed by less fortunate campaigns. Louis might have closed it within two months with greater gains than he made after six more years of fighting, but he set his terms so high that no people could accept them unless all hope of further resistance was over. He demanded among other things an annual embassy to Paris to acknowledge that the liberty of Holland depended upon his good-will. As the war went on Louis's hope to keep Holland isolated proved fallacious. A new European coalition was formed against France, and England finally withdrew from Louis's side and even sent help to the Dutch. The war closes a generation of great generals and brings a new one on to the stage. Turenne was killed—his consummate maneuvering before his death is the military feature of the war; the "great" Condé makes his last campaign; and William of Orange rises into prominence and develops his wonderful talent for making something out of nothing, and for treating every defeat as if it had been a victory.

In 1678 all parties were ready for peace. Holland regained all that she had lost and made most favorable commercial arrangements with the French. It was Spain as usual that suffered to satisfy the pride of Louis. She gave up to him the province of Franche-Comté and several strongly fortified towns in the Netherlands.

Rapid successes
of the French.

A coalition
against France,
of the emperor,
Spain, Branden-
burg, and other
German states.

Franche-Comté
annexed.

Louis at the height of his power.

The war had not been so brilliantly successful for Louis, nor had its gains been so great, as he had hoped for. But he had stood successfully against a European coalition ; he had annexed a province which France had long desired ; the exhaustion which had already begun in France did not show itself upon the surface ; the treasury still seemed full, though Colbert was in despair ; the fleets and armies still seemed in splendid condition. Louis was at the very height of his power. So at least he judged and all Europe with him, and he did not propose to drop his plans for the extension of France though peace had been made.

The "chambers of reunion."

Some of the recent cessions to France had been made "with their dependencies," according to the phrase in the treaties. It now occurred to Louis that possibly some of the "dependencies" had been overlooked, and French "chambers of reunion" were set at work to search out every evidence of feudal relationship which could be exhumed, and, the dependence having been thus established, the reunion was promptly made. The victim of this aggression was Germany, weak and divided, and incapable of resistance. The most important case was Strasburg, where, however, no fiction of a dependency could be used, as it had long been a free city of the Empire. But it was in no condition to resist, and Louis promptly seized it, and Vauban turned it into a French fortress. On the same day the strong fortress of Casale in northern Italy was in a similar way seized by a French force. Three years later the city of Genoa, because it would not yield obedience to the arbitrary orders of Louis, was terribly bombarded and forced to the most humiliating submission. The duke of Savoy was treated as if he were a French subject. It is not strange that Europe stood ready, without waiting for

The seizure of Strasburg,

and of Casale in Italy.

Genoa bombarded.

the next war, to form the League of Augsburg, in form to prevent the infringement of existing treaties, in reality to resist the plans of Louis.

The League of Augsburg, 1686.

It was the English Revolution of 1688, which drove James II. from the throne and made Louis's most implacable enemy, William of Orange, king of England, that was the signal for the outbreak of a general war. For France the war was one of defensive tactics, of barren victories, of barbarous laying waste of temporarily occupied provinces to no good purpose, and of rapidly increasing exhaustion and misery at home. Though neither France nor England realized it clearly, it was the opening conflict between them in the long struggle, the new Hundred Years' War, as it has been called, for colonial supremacy. In our own colonial history we call it King William's War, the first in the long series of French and Indian wars, in which the occupation of North America was at stake.

War with England.

Our colonial King William's War.

In Europe, as in the colonies, the war was indecisive, and the peace of Ryswick merely a truce. It was gained only by sacrifices on the part of Louis. He surrendered all that he had occupied during the war and all his annexations just before it except Strasburg, and he recognized William III. as king of England. But Louis's ambition was at work in the concessions which he made to secure this peace as truly as in any of the conquests which he had ever made. Charles II. of Spain was manifestly drawing to the close of his feeble life, which had been prolonged beyond all expectation, and he would leave no child to succeed him. Now, if ever, the plan which had been so long cherished to seat a French prince on the throne of Spain, perhaps to unite the two crowns, must be carried out. But if Charles II. should die while France was making war upon Spain

The peace of Ryswick.

Louis's ulterior purposes.

The question of the Spanish succession coming on.

there could be but little hope of success in the plan. Peace was necessary also to recruit the energies of France, now beginning to show clearly how much they were suffering from the severe strain of Louis's protracted wars, and Louis was well aware that his purpose might lead to the greatest European war of all, as it did.

Charles II. of Spain names the grandson of Louis XIV. his heir.



HENRI DE LA TOUR D'AUVERGNE, VICOMTE DE
TURENNE.

Born in Sedan, 1611. Killed in battle in Bavaria,
July 26, 1675.

Charles II. lived for three years after the peace of Ryswick. More than one partition treaty was made between the great powers of Europe to dispose of the still vast empire of Spain without the consent of the Spanish people, in the hope of avoiding war, but for one reason or another they all failed. Finally Spain, in the determination not to be dismembered and thinking that

France of all the claimants would be best able to protect her integrity, provided by the will of the king that he should be succeeded by the duke of Anjou, second son of the dauphin.

Impolitic behavior of Louis.

The fear and anger of Europe were again excited when Louis accepted this inheritance for his grandson, but possibly if he had proceeded with more caution he might have secured all that he wished without war.

But he seemed intoxicated with this new proof of his grandeur. "The Pyrenees are no more," whether it was actually said or not, was the spirit that ruled the French court. French troops were sent to garrison the Spanish fortresses in the Low Countries. Contrary to the conditions of Charles's will, it was announced that the duke of Anjou retained all his rights of succession to the throne of France. Spanish ambassadors abroad received instructions from Louis as if the two countries were already united. The Dutch, however, signified their willingness to acquiesce in the arrangement if certain concessions were made them. These Louis haughtily refused. In this crisis of affairs James II., former king of England, died, and Louis at once recognized his son as king. England was already as eager for war as Austria, and this was the last argument needed. In 1701 the great War of the Spanish Succession was begun.

Spain almost annexed to France.

The War of the Spanish Succession is the first war of modern European history which still lingers to some extent in the popular remembrance. This is partly due, at least, to the place which it has taken in literature which is still read. But it was in reality a war of great battles and splendid generalship, the greatest war, if Europe alone be considered, which preceded the age of Napoleon, though not so great for the world at large, or in its ultimate results, as the Seven Years' War of Frederick the Great. The generalship of Marlborough and of Prince Eugene, the victories of Blenheim, Ramillies, and Malplaquet, and the capture of Gibraltar by the English will not soon be forgotten.

Character of the War of the Spanish Succession.

Nearly all Europe, as it then existed, was united against France. Austria, which had first begun the war, counted less in real strength than England and

Louis's enemies.

Holland. England was at this time stronger than she had ever been before. A large number of the smaller states of Germany were on the side of the alliance, including Brandenburg, then just assuming the rank and name of the Kingdom of Prussia. Savoy and Portugal, which were on Louis's side when the war opened, soon abandoned him and went over to the allies. The most of the Spanish people were heartily in favor of Philip V., their new French king, and opposed to the Austrian archduke Charles, the candidate of the other side, whom they believed guilty of planning to dismember the Spanish Empire, which, even if largely a nominal empire, was the only thing left of their former glories.

Spain was on his side.

But Spain was not united. If Castile favored Philip, the old kingdom of Aragon, especially the city of Barcelona and the province of Catalonia, opposed him. The Catalonians had always been discontented since the union of the two crowns which had seemed to them more like the absorption of Aragon in Castile, especially with the constant encroachments of the kings upon their historical liberties, and they had retained with some obstinacy a strong feeling of local independence which has not absolutely disappeared even yet. This division and civil war in Spain, which is one of the features of the larger war, had its counterpart in France in a desperate rising of the remaining Huguenots in Languedoc, the insurrection of Camisards, which led to a local war chiefly guerrilla in its character, and which, though it was hopeless from the start of any larger results, kept a French army some time occupied in its suppression.

Northeastern Spain, however, was opposed to the French.

Insurrection of the "Camisards" in France.

To oppose two such generals as Marlborough and Eugene, Louis had only generals of a second rank. No new Turenne or Condé had arisen since these had been

lost. To oppose the wealth of England and of Holland, he had only disordered finances and an exhausted treasury. Battle after battle was lost by the French, hardly relieved by a few minor successes. But the great semi-circle of fortresses which the genius of Vauban had constructed on the northwestern frontier, checked any serious invasion of the territory of France. The country seemed on the verge of utter exhaustion and collapse in the darkest period, the years 1709 and 1710, when Louis, whose conduct in the midst of these disasters was far more self-controlled and truly deserving of the title "great" than it ever had been in prosperous days, resolved to endure the very worst rather than to accept the humiliating terms of peace demanded by the allies, and appealed frankly and nobly to the French people, and the nation, as it always does in similar circumstances, instantly responded with an elasticity of vigor and energy which is a race characteristic. Neither could the people of Castile be conquered, though Madrid had been twice occupied and the country apparently subdued by the enemy. Finally some turning of the tide of success in favor of the French, a change of party government in England, by which the friends of Marlborough lost office, the election of the archduke Charles to succeed his brother as emperor, made the allies as willing as the French to end the war.

The war not favorable to France.

Louis appeals to the French people.

The allies finally ready for peace.

The treaties which are together called the peace of Utrecht, signed in the spring of 1713, secured the greatest gains of the war to England. If the great object which Louis XIV. had had in view was to make his grandson king of Spain, he had succeeded, for the allies, except Austria, which only yielded because it could not carry on the conflict single handed, were ready at last to grant the Spanish people the king of their choice. But it was a

The peace of Utrecht.

Philip V. recognized as king of Spain.

barren success. It was never of any real advantage to France that a branch of her royal family ruled in Spain, as they have continued to do until the present time, with one or two brief intervals. The two countries were no nearer union than before, for Europe took care to provide by solemn guarantees against a union of the two crowns, and the nature of things made a union of policy no more likely in the future than in the past.

If the Spanish people had fought to prevent dismemberment, they failed in that. The Netherlands were given to Austria, and are henceforth known as the Austrian instead of the Spanish Netherlands. The greater part of the Spanish possessions in Italy went also to Austria, but Sicily, which had to be exchanged afterwards for Sardinia, went to the duke of Savoy, who was granted the title of king, the first great step upward of the present reigning family of Italy. England's gains were colonial and commercial. She retained Gibraltar and the island of Minorca, which contained the strongly fortified harbor of Port Mahon. In North America France ceded to her, or renewed the cession of, the Hudson's Bay Territory, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia. Spain granted her, at the expense of France, the *Assiento* contract, the privilege of importing negro slaves into the Spanish colonies in the New World. The only important advantage gained by Holland was to make sure that the Netherlands—the kingdom of Belgium on the present map of Europe—which they considered essential, as a barrier state, to their safety, did not go into the hands of France.

England had made no gains which seemed of any great value in Europe. France had preserved her home territory and the former conquests of Louis practically intact. But the war marks the rise of England in

Austria gains
at the expense
of Spain.

The ancestor of
Victor Emman-
uel made a
king.

England makes
the largest
gains.

The chief loss
of France was
not in territory,
but in strength.

influence and acknowledged power to a position she had never held before, and the gains she made from the war were of a sort to increase the sources of her strength, while France was left by it crippled and exhausted, and hardly beginning as yet to recognize the nature of the struggle before her, or to discern the fields where it must be fought out, or to see in England her greatest rival.

We have seen how Louis's second war, that against the Dutch Republic, was in one way a turning point in the history of France in weakening her most valuable ally against the advance of the English, and the period of peace which followed, the time of the reunions, in another by rousing the general fear of Europe that no treaties would set bounds to the aggressions of Louis. The same period in other ways was a turning point in the history of France of great importance.

A period of changes in the history of France.

The Protestants in France, since the destruction of their political independence by Richelieu, had remained quiet and loyal members of the nation, in the enjoyment of their religious rights. But to the narrow mind of Louis XIV. it was a sin for which he was personally responsible that heresy flourished in his kingdom, and to his pride as an absolute king it was deeply galling that there was one thing which he greatly desired of certain of his subjects and could not command, their conversion to catholicism. However much the influence of Madame de Maintenon may have had to do with the revocation of the edict of Nantes there is no doubt but that she was urging the king in the direction in which he was himself inclined to go. The continued efforts to convert the Huguenots by force, which went before the revocation, and which gave to the languages of Europe the word "dragonnade," are familiar enough. In October, 1685, the edict of Nantes was formally re-

The revocation of the edict of Nantes.

The "dragonnades."

The emigration
of the Hugue-
nots.

voked, the Huguenots were deprived of the privilege of public worship and of their civil rights. The new edict did not deprive them of their religion. They were allowed to remain Protestants, but they lost all legal rights and were exposed to constant dangers in person and property. The emigration which followed is an element in our own colonial history as it is in the history of many European states. Though forbidden to leave the kingdom the Huguenots fled by the thousand and carried their skill and their frugality with them. As in the beginning of French protestantism, they were chiefly of the middle class, the mechanic and the trader, and formed a considerable element in the reserve force of the state. The loss to France was great but still it may be easily overstated. France could bear a proportionate loss to-day and instantly recover. It was the peculiar combination of circumstances which made it so serious—the exhaustive foreign wars, the prodigal waste of fashionable life, faulty financial theories and practice—it was this combination which made the revocation of the edict of Nantes an element in the decline of France.

The "liberties
of the Gallican
Church."

But if Louis was bigoted and superstitious in matters of religion, he would not tolerate any rights of the pope in France which would interfere with his own absolute control of everything. In 1682, when a dispute arose with the pope over his right to appoint to vacant bishoprics and to enjoy the revenues during a vacancy, he proceeded without hesitation to extreme measures, and an assembly of the French clergy adopted, at his instigation, the famous four articles of the liberties of the Gallican Church. These affirmed: first, that the pope has no right to interfere in the political affairs of states; second, that general councils

of the church are superior to the pope in the government of the church ; third, that the pope has no right to change the usages and rules of the Gallican Church ; and fourth, that the final determination of the doctrines of the church rests not with the pope but with a general council. These propositions sound like a declaration of independence, as if they were intended as the foundation of a national and self-governing church, but they had no such effect. They were merely a declaration of the king's that the pope must leave him to govern the church of France as he should think best, and they were of advantage to the royal absolutism only.

The four articles.

We have already intimated how, in another respect, this reign was a turning point in the history of France—in the disregard of its opportunities for future world empire. This was not because Louis did not have the opportunities brought to his attention by men who saw them clearer than he could himself, but because he could not be brought to a right estimate of their importance for the future. La Salle, who saw the vision of a French empire in America and the hope of excluding the English from any continental rule, was twice in France during this period to try to enlist the government in his plans, but in vain. At another time, Leibnitz, the German philosopher, urged upon Louis the great advantages which would come to France from the occupation of Egypt, which could be had, he pointed out, for the taking. His argument is directed to show, it is true, how much France would gain in the struggle with the Dutch from the ease with which their East Indian empire could be broken up if Egypt were in the hands of the French, but the occupation of that country would have been of incalculable value in the later conflict with England. But Louis could not be persuaded;

Louis's foresight limited to Europe.

La Salle and America.

Leibnitz and Egypt.

and the opportunity passed, never to return. France failed to secure, at a time when, apparently, it might easily have been done, the commanding position both in

the East and the West for which she strove in vain only half a century later, and which all the genius of Napoleon could not acquire.

The age of Louis XIV. owes something of its greatness in the popular judgment to its literary brilliancy. It is the first great age of French literature. Not but that France had produced before works of literary art which will not be forgotten.



LA FONTAINE.

Born at Château-Thierry, July 8, 1621. Died at Paris, April 13, 1695.

But the age of Louis XIV. is the first period which is crowded with great names. General characteristics only are in place here, and of these two should be especially noticed. It has been called the Augustan Age of French literature and very correctly so. It was distinctly an age of quantity and of finish in literature rather than of quality. It is a most remarkable galaxy of names when they are all brought together, but very few of them rise into the ranks of genius. Their work is not constructive but imitative. It is not free and strong, but careful and studied. It is, as it has been called, the

The literature of the age.

An age of polish rather than of genius.

most literary of literatures. Its theme is not nature but man, and that the somewhat artificial man of society.

In the second place, the influence of the real age of Louis XIV., when it has had time to make itself felt, seems to have been unfavorable to literature. The greatest writers of the age, those who come nearest to the line which divides genius from talent or who pass it, all belong to the first portion of the age—a time when the peculiar characteristics of the age of Louis XIV. had not yet begun to rule. The dividing line

Louis's paternalism,

seems to fall, as it does in the field of Louis's political and military successes, in the period between his second and third wars, say about 1685. Before that date the larger number of the great works of the age had been written. After it we seem to trace the effect of that royal patronage and paternal supervision which selected for pensions and honors the particular sort of litera-



RACINE.

Born at La Ferté-Milon, December 21, 1639.
Died in Paris, April 22, 1699.

ture of which it approved, and made the authors of any other kind clearly conscious of the frowns of fortune. At any rate, the literary characteristics of the last part of the age are such as might be expected to be produced

not favorable to genius.

by such a system—the reign of smaller minds, the domination of fixed rules, increasing flattery and adulation. It is characteristic of the age that one of its most permanent results was to subject French dramatic genius for the future to the iron rule of the “three unities,” the

The three unities.

unity of time, of place, and of plot.

In the reign of Louis XIV. the royal absolutism which had been so long forming in France was made the fundamental theory of the state. If he never made use of the famous phrase which has been attributed to him, “*L’état, c’est moi*,” there are other sentences in plenty, used by himself and others,



MOLIÈRE.

Born in Paris, January 16, 1622. Died February 17, 1673.

“I am the state.”

which just as clearly indicate the belief of the time that the state was really absorbed in the king. Louis’s act in taking the actual control of public affairs into his own hands and making all the ministries directly responsible to himself was a kind of logical, but not necessary, embodiment of the theory in practice. There was during his reign not the slightest real check upon the royal will. Providence might set limits to the carrying out of his purposes in natural obstacles on the too strong armies of the enemy, but nothing else had the right to do so.

Responsibility to the nation denied.

Louis distinctly states his belief that he is responsible for his conduct to God alone.

Nothing corresponding to a constitution now remained in the state. Parlement still retained a form of remonstrance, but only by the king's sufferance. Some of the provinces still enjoyed considerable local liberties, but merely because these did not interfere with the operations of the general government. They never could have retained them, if the king had had a sufficient motive for destroying them. The nobility and the clergy still retained privileges, but only such as had no influence upon the conduct of public affairs. Every real function of government was completely under the king's control and could be shaped or modified as he pleased. The king was the state, whether Louis ever uttered the exact phrase or not.

No constitutional checks upon the king.

It follows that Louis is personally responsible for the results of his reign, so far as any one can be held responsible for them—so far as they are not the results of ignorance which the age could not avoid, or of tendency too firmly fixed in the national life by the growth of the past to be suddenly changed. And when all deductions of this sort are made, the responsibility remains a heavy one. For one item, the responsibility for the economic exhaustion and misery of France, at the close of his reign, due to the War of the Spanish Succession, which certainly handicapped her in the mortal conflicts of the eighteenth century, notwithstanding the fact that in that century, as in the nineteenth, the recuperative power of the nation was remarkable—the responsibility for this condition of things must rest upon Louis and upon his advisers, whose advice he followed chiefly, then as usually, because it led him in the direction of his own inclinations.

Louis's responsibility.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

A new age in French history.

See Martin's "The Decline of the French Monarchy."

See second lining page for map of France at this period.

The rise of world politics.

WITH the death of Louis XIV., France closed a long period in her history beginning with the accession of Henry IV.—a period characterized in her internal history by the final completion of the absolute monarchy, in fact and in theory, and in her external history by the attempt to humble the House of Hapsburg and to advance France to the dictatorship of Europe. The monarchy was now ideally absolute, but the dictatorship had not been gained. With the accession of Louis XV., France enters upon a new period of her history—she had been gradually entering upon it for the last twenty-five years, but it is more than another twenty-five years before she is really conscious of the change. It was an age in which her great rival was no longer Austria but England, and in which the prize at stake was not the dictatorship of Europe but the colonial empire of the world.

Louis XV. came to the throne at the very dawn of an age of world politics, when those interests were beginning to arise which were by degrees to dwarf merely European issues into comparative insignificance, and to determine alliances, not by religious or dynastic considerations nor even by those of European balance of power, but by the interests of commerce and of colonial expansion. The failure of France to awake to this momentous change had already allowed England to make most dangerous advances. The odds, however, were

still, in appearance at least, in favor of France. But the slow awakening of France in the next generation was fatal. Before the nation was fully alive to the situation its advantages had all been swept away, and England—the British Empire—had become so powerful that further rivalry seemed almost hopeless.

For this slow awakening to interests outside the continent of Europe, the past history of France was responsible. Her foreign policy—her most cherished ambitions—had begun to be shaped in the generation which immediately preceded the discovery of America, and nothing had occurred before the beginning of the eighteenth century to prove to the nations that the House of Hapsburg was no longer to be feared. It is no wonder that this long contest had thoroughly drilled into the national consciousness the belief that the road to national expansion led to Italy or to the Rhine, and made it slow to realize the rise of other interests and of other enemies.

France held
back by her
traditional
foreign policy.

The first important act of the new reign was a strange commentary on the plans of Louis XIV., and an evidence of the futility, in every age of the world, of the attempt to bind the policy of states by the family alliances of dynasties. Death had been busy in the royal family of France in the last years of Louis XIV.'s life, and when he died he was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV., then only five years old. The question of the regency was the last question which the old king had to settle. The mother of his heir was dead. His nearest relative would be his uncle, King Philip V. of Spain, but he had renounced his rights of succession in France, and that renunciation had been pronounced final by all the powers of Europe in the treaty of Utrecht. The first prince of the blood in France was Philip, duke of Orleans, nephew of Louis XIV., a man of considerable

Louis XV.,
1715-1774.

Philip, duke of
Orleans, regent.

abilities but a prodigy of vice. The king had never liked him, but he could not bring himself to disregard his clear rights, and by his will he appointed him regent. The king of Spain, however, let it be very clearly seen that he submitted very unwillingly to this arrangement, and that, if the young king should die, he did not propose to abandon his right of succession in France. England, seeing in Orleans the future regent, had been for some time before the death of Louis XIV. urging upon him the policy of an alliance between them, on the one side against the exiled Stuarts, and on the other against the plans of Philip V. This alliance the duke of Orleans was persuaded to enter upon soon after he became regent. It was joined not long after by Austria and Holland, and became the "Quadruple Alliance" for the enforcement of the terms of the treaty of Utrecht.

His alliance
with England.

The "Quad-
ruple Alliance."

England and
France join in
war against
Spain.

Philip of Spain, finding his plans in France for the moment checked, turned his attention to the conquest of some of the Italian provinces which had been assigned to Austria at the time when he was recognized as king of Spain. It was absurdly impossible in the teeth of the Quadruple Alliance. The English destroyed the reconstructed Spanish fleet, and a French army invaded the country which Louis XIV. had gone to the expense of a great European war to bind forever to the interests of France. The regent has been severely criticised for thus uniting with the enemies of France in war upon her natural ally. But it was a legitimate policy for him, that of self-preservation, and France lost nothing and England gained nothing of any real value by it. The greatest significance of the alliance and of the war is its revelation of the futility of the hopes which led to the War of the Spanish Succession.

The great failure of the regent's government was on

its financial side, but that is a failure for which he can hardly be called to an account, for although all through the eighteenth century the fatal weakness of France was in her disordered finances, no French statesman proved himself equal to the problem of a remedy. During the last thirty years of the reign of Louis XIV. the national debt had been multiplied by twenty. It was now more than 3,000,000,000 of livres, much of it at a heavy rate of interest. The people paid in taxes 165,000,000 livres per year, but after deducting the charge for interest less than 70,000,000 remained to pay the 150,000,000 of necessary government expenses. The financial situation of the kingdom was not likely to improve under such conditions.

French finance
in disorder.

See Perkins's
"France under
the Regency,"
pp. 353-4.

It was in circumstances of this kind that the regent determined to allow the Scottish financier, John Law, an opportunity to carry out his ideas. Law had studied very carefully the financial facts of his day, and with an unusually clear judgment. Many of the theories which he had formed were far in advance of the age and are now universally accepted as the fundamental principles of financial science and business practice. But with these he held to many notions, as is not strange seeing that he was a pioneer in the study of finance, which a more complete knowledge has shown to be false theories, though some of them are still cherished by the more ignorant, often to the embarrassment of secretaries of the treasury, especially in democratic countries. Two of these, not unfamiliar in the recent political history of the United States, are of especial importance in understanding the operations of Law at this time: that credit itself creates wealth, and that a large per capita issue of currency improves the condition of business and renders it easier to make money.


John Law.

His theories.

Two especially
important.

Law promised to make France the richest country in the world, if he were allowed to put his system in operation. The regent seems to have had some faith in him, and he may very well have felt that the situation could not easily be made worse and that something must be done to try to improve it; even something desperate. The beginnings were gradual. He was first allowed to

The first step,
May, 1716.



FACSIMILE OF A BILL OF LAW'S ROYAL BANK. Reduced.

establish a private bank, the first bank organized in Paris, with the power to issue paper currency redeemable in gold of a fixed standard. This succeeded so well that in December, 1718, it was transformed into a government bank.

The Mississippi
Company.

Even before this Law had advanced to another portion of his system. In August, 1717, the commercial company had been organized which is known as the Mississippi Company. The monopoly of commerce with Louisiana was granted to this company and full powers of government in the territory. Soon other companies of foreign commerce were consolidated with Law's, and

other monopolies were conferred upon it like that of the tobacco trade ; it contracted for the farming of all the taxes and assumed the whole national debt of France.

At first the wildest predictions of Law seemed to be more than fulfilled. It was the first epoch of stock jobbing and wild speculation in modern times. Enormous fortunes seemed to be made in a few months, a competence while a man was eating his dinner. The stock of the company, whose face value was 500 francs, sold at one time for 15,000 and even some sales were reported to have been made at 20,000 francs. The company voted to pay dividends of forty per cent on the face value. In the mean time only three per cent was received on the national debt which had been assumed. In 1720, the inevitable crash came and the system of Law collapsed more rapidly than it had risen. Some by selling in time retained the fortunes which they had made. Many more were ruined. The government gained nothing, except by some repudiation of its obligations, and its finances were in as great confusion after as before. The general result was injurious to France. It delayed the organization of a state bank, already in successful operation in Holland and in England ; and it discouraged colonial and commercial enterprises, in which direction the true interests of France lay. Law himself seems to have been entirely sincere and to have sought the advantage of France as he understood it.

The bubble
inflated.

The collapse.

Louis XV. became of age early in 1723, but the duke of Orleans retained control of affairs until his death at the close of the same year. He was succeeded by another prince of the blood, the duke of Bourbon, whose principal achievement was to marry the king, selecting for his wife Marie Leczinska, daughter of the exiled king of Poland, and sending home the infanta of Spain, who

The marriage
of Louis XV.

had been betrothed to Louis, to make way for her. She was some seven years older than the king, poor and without influence, and was selected that the queen might owe everything to the minister and perpetuate his power. But the plan was a failure. The queen obtained no political influence, and the duke was soon deprived of



LOUIS XV.

office. The king declared, in imitation of Louis XIV., that he would be his own prime minister, but Louis XV. lived chiefly to follow his pleasures, and the real ruler of France was Fleury, who held charge of affairs till 1743. Under his ministry there was a rapid recovery of commercial and business prosperity in France. The War of the Polish Suc-

The War of the
Polish Succession.

cession, fought in favor of the father-in-law of Louis, reflected a little glory upon the country with its military successes and the favorable terms obtained at its close in the treaty of Vienna, but the most important change was in the foreign relations of the country.

The special fact which appeared, at least upon the surface of things, to lead to the breaking up of the old alliances in the international politics of the time and to the formation of new ones, was the peculiar situation of

the House of Hapsburg. The male line of the family would become extinct with the death of the reigning emperor, Charles VI., and the great object of the last part of his life was to secure the succession of the hereditary lands of the house to his daughter, Maria Theresa. Instead of setting about this as Frederick the Great would have advised, by providing a thoroughly disciplined army of two hundred thousand men, he tried to bind all the states of Europe in advance by treaties to recognize her right of succession. In 1724, the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI. was accepted as the fundamental law of the succession in all the Austrian dominions. By degrees the emperor obtained the promise of all the European states to recognize this arrangement, but when he died, in 1740, the superiority of Frederick's method was clear, for he immediately advanced certain old claims to some little territories in Silesia, and, with the armies which he had inherited from his father, "the drill sergeant," he seized the whole province. It was the beginning of a general war.

Extinction of
the House of
Hapsburg.

Maria Theresa
recognized as
its heiress.

In the mean time events had been taking place elsewhere which were of far greater importance for the future of France and of the world than these, even though we remember that these events carried with them the rise of Prussia to a power of the first rank. Soon after 1730 France and Spain had begun to draw together. It was not so much the family relationship of the two Bourbon dynasties which led to this result as their common fear of the growing commercial and colonial power of England, and their perception of the fact that the only hope of checking this growth and of recovering what they had already lost lay in union. Both states gave great attention to the reconstruction of their navies; Spain tried to cut down the English commerce with her colonies,

Alliance of
France and
Spain against
England.

which had grown to considerable proportions since the peace of Utrecht, though not recognized as a legitimate commerce by any treaties between the countries, and to turn it over to France ; France, having recovered much of her economic and commercial prosperity in the last generation and just beginning to realize the possibilities which might lie in colonial expansion, was anxious to try conclusions with England once more, in the hope of putting an end to her threatened supremacy on the seas. It was a great misfortune for France at this crisis that she still retained her fear of the House of Hapsburg, and could not resist the temptation to make the most of the opportunity offered by the disputed succession to try to break up the Austrian lands into fragments which would be no longer dangerous rivals of France. This unfortunate feeling in France was balanced to a certain extent by the interest in continental affairs which was forced upon England by the fact that her king was also elector of Hanover.

France hampered by her fear of Austria.

England and Spain at war.

France and Austria also. In 1741.

As early as 1739, the bitterness of feeling in England on account of the treatment of English traders by the Spanish colonial authorities had forced Walpole against his will to declare war with Spain.* France sympathized with Spain in this war, but she kept the peace with England, until the opportunity to destroy the power of Austria tempted her to enter the continental war. This involved a war with England, the ally of Austria, which should have been for France, as it was for England, chiefly a colonial and commercial war. But those who controlled the policy of France thought otherwise, and the nation expended its energies upon the Continent, where the Austrian Netherlands were soon overrun, and even a portion of Holland, but no further successes of importance were gained.

In India, the struggle for possession was just beginning. The two leaders of the French, Dupleix in India and La Bourdonnais, the governor of Mauritius, were far superior in abilities to the English officers then in the East, and they saw clearly the great empire which was to be gained and the wisest steps to secure it. If they could have laid aside their personal jealousies in a common policy, and have had

In India.

the support which they deserved from France, they could, apparently, have destroyed all possibility of an English dominion. As it was, Madras, the English station on the east coast, was conquered. In America, though the French had, in Louisiana and Canada and along the interior rivers, the best geographical position from which to

*In America.*

DUPLÉIX.

Born about 1697. Died about 1763.

occupy the continent, the English colonies were growing more rapidly in population and resources, and they could easily be persuaded to make a determined effort for the conquest of their rivals. The capture of the strong fortress of Louisburg by untrained New England troops gave the colonists a degree of self-confidence which had no slight influence on later events.

June, 1745.

The war was everywhere indecisive. The treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which closed it, settled nothing. Frederick the Great retained Silesia, but Maria Theresa was determined upon revenge at the first favorable moment.

Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1745.

France restored her conquests in Europe to Austria, and gave back Madras to England in return for Louisburg. The people of New England were bitterly disappointed at this sacrifice of the conquest which they had made, but, looked at from the point of view of the Empire as a whole, the exchange was a wise one. It was far more important to recover the position lost in India than to retain Louisburg. England gained some slight commercial advantages from the war ; France lost something in strength and opportunity ; otherwise it left things as they were. It is to be regarded merely as an introduction to the decisive struggle which comes on immediately.


The peace does not end the war in the colonies.

England and France had made peace with one another, but it was little more than peace in form. On the two great continents where they were struggling for empire there was scarcely so much as a brief truce, and open war soon broke out in complete disregard of the peace between the mother countries in Europe. In America, the French undertook the fortification of their line of communication along the Great Lakes and the Ohio, and the English colonists could not allow this. Braddock's expedition and bloody defeat, the attack on New Brunswick with the removal of the Acadians, and the fighting in the vicinity of Lake George were all before formal war began. In India, Dupleix continued to develop, successfully and rapidly, his plans for a French empire, and was checked only by the rise of a man of equal genius on the English side. The brilliant capture and defense of Arcot by the young Robert Clive, and the ruin of the plans of Dupleix, came also in the interval of supposed peace.

Braddock's expedition.

The defense of Arcot.

When the European war again broke out, France and England were found on the sides opposite to those which they had supported in the last war. France and Austria



COSTUME OF THE COURT OF LOUIS XV.

had come to an understanding, and England was therefore necessarily on the side of Frederick. The events of this war are familiar to all. In Europe, it was the great

The Seven
Years' War.

war of Frederick the Great, who fought, single handed, with only the money of England to support him, against all Europe. France made great and costly exertions, but won no proportionate successes. She had no generals in the field and no statesmen in the cabinet.

In America.

In America, "the old French and Indian War," as we called it, was an almost continuous succession of reverses for the French, crowned finally by the loss of Quebec and Montreal, which virtually meant the loss of all their northern settlements, their strongest position on the continent.

In India.

In India, no Frenchman of equal ability succeeded Dupleix, who was recalled and disgraced just before the opening of the war, because his pushing schemes for the French control of India were likely to cost too much! Lally, who was the French commander during the most of the war, was earnestly determined to destroy the power of England, but his abilities were not equal to the task, and he was completely defeated by Eyre Coote. Still earlier, Clive had conquered Bengal, and the English were now as supreme in India as in North America.

The losses of France.

At the conclusion of the war, France withdrew entirely from North America, ceding all east of the Mississippi, except New Orleans, to England, and all west of the Mississippi to Spain, in compensation for Florida, which Spain had been compelled to give up to England. In India, the stations which the French had had before the war were restored to them, but as trading stations only. The right of fortification was renounced, and all hope of a great French empire abandoned. France lost also her chief settlement in Africa, Senegal, and a number of islands in the West Indies. She had sacrificed, mainly through neglect and the failure to discern where her true interests lay, the brilliant prospect which she

had once possessed, more surely than had England, of a great world empire. This was now her enemy's, and, though France was to attempt its recovery in later times, she was never to do so with any real prospect of success. On the continent of Europe, the peace simply restored the conditions, so far as France was concerned, which had prevailed before the war. The attempt to humble Prussia, however, had not succeeded, and that state had risen, in the opinion of Europe, to be a state of the first rank, and had laid securely the foundations of that power which after a hundred years was to inflict upon France a most signal defeat:

The rise of
Prussia.

The close of the war falls in the ministry of the duke of Choiseul, who had been chief minister of France for some years. He was a skillful diplomatist, and, with the exception of Turgot, probably the ablest French minister between Louis XIV. and the Revolution ; but his ministry was not a success at home or abroad. France was now in a condition, exhausted with heavy burdens and eaten with abuses, where no ministry could be successful without the entire reconstruction of the state. Only the very highest statesmanship, backed by the long and steady support of the king, could have accomplished such a reconstruction, and this was an impossible combination in the France of the last half of the eighteenth century. It would have been an impossible combination even if the France of that age had been plentifully supplied with statesmen of the highest abilities. Louis XV. was a king who readily resigned himself to whatever course seemed easiest at the moment, with the comfortable reflection that things would last as they were as long as he, and that his successor must look out for himself. Louis XVI. was a king who earnestly desired the good of his people, but his weakness made any permanent

Choiseul.

Reform
practically
impossible.

There was no
king who would
steadily follow
a difficult
policy.

policy impossible. The only other road to reconstruction lay through revolution, and these are the years in which France was rapidly drifting to revolution.

The war had been very costly to France. The national debt had been increased ; a considerable proportion of the revenues had been anticipated ; and, though peace had been made, the subsidy to Austria, which had fallen into arrears, must be continued for some years. A limited repudiation was not found to be

sufficient, and there seemed to be nothing to do but to go on with the war taxes, although the nation had been promised that they should cease with the war. The Parlement refused to register the necessary edicts, but it was forced to yield. Then followed a war of words with the government, in which the remonstrances of the Parlement and of the other courts were couched in language of great vigor



DECORATED SEDAN-CHAIR OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

and directness. They asserted that the right of registration was a fundamental right, not to be interfered with by the king, and the Court of Aids urged the king to take the advice of his people through the Estates General. The storm became so great that the government thought it wise to yield on some points of minor detail, but it could not do so on anything essential.

Choiseul undertook also to revive commerce, and to find compensation for the colonial losses of France. An

Finances.

The opposition
of Parlement.

Commercial
policy.

attempt to force a rapid development of French Guiana, unwisely directed, proved a failure, but there was some advance in the French West India settlements. Better commercial regulations, especially freer trade in grain, led to some improvement in rural France, and there was a slow gain in population.* None of these improvements was great enough, however, to balance the careless prodigality of the court and to check the increasing annual deficit.

To the foreign interests of France, Choiseul gave especial attention. The army was reduced, but reorganized and made more effective. The navy also was reformed; ships were rapidly built, and supplies accumulated. The death of Stanislas, the father-in-law of Louis XV., brought Lorraine to France, by the terms of the treaty of 1735, and about the same time Corsica was acquired from Genoa, just in time to make Bonaparte a French citizen by birth. But in the most important case which arose in the foreign relations of France, the negotiations which preceded the first partition of Poland, Choiseul was not strong enough to protect the interests of his country as he understood them, though his ministry had ended before the partition was consummated. Choiseul had gained his place, in part at least, through the support of Madame de Pompadour; he lost it not alone through the dissatisfaction of the king with his foreign policy, but through the influence of the king's new favorite, Madame du Barry, whom the duke would not stoop to flatter.

Foreign policy.

The first partition of Poland.

Fall of Choiseul, December, 1770.

France fell then into the hands of ministers far less able and more selfish than Choiseul, and the last years of Louis XV. are the most humiliating in the annals of

From bad to worse.

* The population was estimated by contemporaries, in 1767, at twenty-two millions, and, in 1791, at from twenty-five to twenty-seven millions. See Martin, "Decline of the French Monarchy," Vol. II., page 212.

the nation. A common courtesan was the real ruler. Measures of violence—forced loans and repudiation—afforded only a temporary relief in the financial necessities of the state, and served merely to postpone the evil day of real reform as long as the king lived. Under the reign of Du Barry, indeed, the court became more rapacious and wasteful than ever. The Parlement of Paris, opposing the ideas of the court, was dissolved and the supreme judicial system reorganized. The monopoly and secret speculation in grain in the interest of the king—the “famine compact”—excited the anger of the people. Abroad, a hint of English opposition sufficed to compel the French ministers to drop their plans. No improvement was possible while the king lived, and his death, in a little more than three years after the fall of Choiseul, was received as a public blessing.

The “famine compact.”

May 10, 1774.

Louis XVI.,
1774-1793.

His grandson, Louis XVI., was a better man, but hardly a better ruler. If Louis XV. was the most contemptible of kings, his successor was among the weakest, and, in the crisis which confronted France, weakness in a good king was the greatest of crimes. Only the utmost strength and firmness of the king in the support for years of an unpopular policy could have secured the reformation of France without a revolution, and of this Louis XVI. was incapable.

Turgot.

The new reign began with some promise. Shortly after Louis's accession he appointed Turgot minister of finance, and definitely promised to support him in the wide-reaching schemes of reform which the minister laid before him. Turgot was a trained economist in the young science of political economy; he was imbued with the philosophical notions of the day; and he had a most earnest desire to be of service to the people.

His ideas.

Besides this he was a man of very great ability. As intendant of Limoges he had proved himself a practical reformer, and the condition of the province had been very greatly improved by the measures which he had carried through.

In accepting the ministry of finance, he earnestly represented to Louis the unpopularity of the course which he desired to pursue, and the necessity of the faithful support of the king if it was to be made successful. Louis gave him his promise. Relying upon this, Turgot began at once to carry out the reforms which seemed to him necessary, without regard to the opposition which they excited on the part of all sorts of persons who were interested in maintaining the old abuses. His fundamental principles, as he stated them to the king, were no repudiation, no loans, and no heavier taxes.

To carry out these principles, and yet meet the expenses of the state, required great changes, and every change struck at the interest of some privileged class. The reforms which he introduced in the collection of the revenue, though of great advantage to the state, deprived the revenue farmers of some of their privileges, and seemed to be steps toward the collection of all revenue by the state itself, and therefore they excited the alarm and opposition of a rich and influential

Louis promises to support Turgot's foreign measures.



TURGOT.

Born May 10, 1727. Died March 20, 1781.

The enemies which Turgot made.

Revenue farmers.

class. The free trade in grain which he established through France drew upon him the hostility of the speculators, who were anxious to maintain the monopolies in which even the king had been interested in the last reign. His attempt to free the workman from the restrictions of the trade corporations roused the anger of another powerful body. His steps toward subjecting all landowners to an equal system of taxation, and toward the abolition of all feudal dues, threatened to deprive the nobility of their most cherished privileges, and of nearly all that remained to remind them of the position which they had once held in the state. His philosophical views and his desire to abolish most of the monasteries and to reform the church in the interests of the parish priests, brought the powerful influence of the clergy to the aid of his enemies. The court was opposed to him because it was opposed to all economy.

One other body of his enemies remains to be noticed, that which was the mouthpiece of them all, the Parlement. Soon after the appointment of Turgot, and in opposition to the advice of that minister, Louis had committed the serious mistake of reëstablishing the Parlement, which had been abolished in the reign of Louis XV. It was a serious mistake if the state was to be reformed and its strength restored without a revolution, and under the direction of the absolute monarchy, for the Parlement was the only organ of constitutional opposition to the will of the king, and, manned by the holders of hereditary offices, it was in full sympathy with the privileged classes and opposed to reform.

Turgot's reforms were successful upon the financial side. The reduction of expenses and the increase of income brought the two sides of the account together, so that there would have been no deficit but for the

Trade corporations.

The nobles.

The church.

The position of the Parlement.

Financial improvement.

necessity of paying off arrears. But the strain was too great for the king. He did not possess even the degree of strength which had enabled Louis XIII. to support the policy of Richelieu, and after an effort of a little less than two years, Turgot was abruptly dismissed by Louis and everything fell back into the old ways.

After a brief interval the care of the finances was given to Necker, a Swiss banker of Paris. He was a skillful financier, but as minister his art consisted in making the best of a bad situation without attempting to improve it by uncomfortable reforms. He made such little reforms and economies as

could be carried through without exciting serious opposition, and, by making a good showing and improving the credit of the government, he succeeded in borrowing large sums and postponing the worst difficulties for a time.

It was during his ministry that France went to war with England, in aid of the American colonists who had proclaimed their independence. Considering the situation of France it was an unwise war. But the national desire to embrace this opportunity to take vengeance on England for the losses of the last war was too strong to be resisted, and the opportunity was certainly a good



Fall of Turgot.
May 12, 1776.

Necker.

COIFFURE À LA BELLE-POULE.
In honor of the victory of the frigate *La Belle-Poule* over an English ship, 1778.

The American
Revolution.

one. In the war, the reconstructed French navy held its own very well against the English, and gained some important successes. This was especially true in the East Indies, where the able French commander, Suffren, seemed in a fair way to destroy the English Empire when he was stopped by the conclusion of peace. In the peace of 1783, France recovered Senegal in Africa and some islands in the West Indies, and England was obliged to restore to Spain Minorca and east and west Florida, and to acknowledge the independence of the thirteen colonies. The vengeance of France was complete, more complete in the future, indeed, than at the time, for the rent then made in the Anglo-Saxon world time seems to find it impossible to heal, even at the end of the nineteenth century, when the position of the race throughout the world, in the era of great changes which seems approaching, would be secured from every danger by such a reunion, to the great advantage of both its halves. But the immediate material success of France in the war was hardly great enough to justify its cost.

French gains
from the war.

Effect upon
the Anglo-
Saxon future.

Before the war had closed, Necker's ministry had come to an end. In order to increase the public confidence, and so to secure a better market for his loans, he had formed the plan of publishing an official statement of the state of the national finances, in imitation of the English practice; at least he was accused of this imitation. This publication had the desired effect upon the general public, although the statement of both revenue and expenses was very incomplete. But its effect upon the privileged classes was to arouse the same opposition before which Turgot had gone down, and which the slender reforms of Necker had already begun to excite. The publication of the "Account" seemed to

Necker pub-
lishes an
account of
the national
finances.

them a declaration of war against the abuses from which their incomes came, for Necker had not hesitated to reveal to the public the extent of at least a part of these. The attack which followed upon the minister was not due so much to what he had done as to what it was feared he was about to do. In the less than ten years of his reign, Louis had grown perceptibly weaker, and more under the control of the strongest pressure of the moment. He yielded now almost immediately. The "Account" was published in January, and in May Necker gave up his office. The general public of France gave Necker credit for greater statesmanship and reforming zeal than he really possessed, and his fall was charged against the rulers of France in the account which was rapidly accumulating for settlement.

Excites the fear
of the privi-
leged classes.

1781.

The few years that are now left before the opening of the Revolution are years of increasing difficulties, of reckless and extravagant ministers who are driven to be reformers by the necessities of their situation, and of increasing hostility toward the court and the queen, the heedless and indiscreet Marie Antoinette. Calonne, who shortly succeeded Necker, conducted the government on the principle, sometimes adopted in the difficulties of private individuals, that a reckless expenditure is the best foundation of credit. He did succeed in adding five hundred million to the national debt in three years, but he could not keep it up. The plan of reform to which he was forced was a kind of eclectic scheme of Turgot and Necker together, but Calonne proposed to make his way secure by getting the privileged classes to consent in advance to be reformed, by reviving the Assembly of Notables, which had not been convened since 1626. "It is Necker over again," cried the poor king when Calonne asked him to sanction his plans.

Still on the
downward
road.

The "Nota-
bles" convened.

But it was worse for the old *régime* than Necker, for asking the consent of the Notables was but a step on the way to asking the consent of the nation.

January 29,
1787.

April 9.

Parlement
again.

August 25, 1788.

The Estates
General.

Calonne's assembly met, but it quarreled with him, and the king sent him into exile as the easiest thing to do. His successor, Brienne, got on better with the Notables, but he brought on a violent contest with the Parlement over the registration of the new measures and others that followed soon. Louis at first attempted to coerce the Parlement. Its members were arrested and exiled, and finally the Parlement itself was reconstructed, as in the time of Louis XV. But when Brienne, unable to keep up pretenses any longer, even by promising to call a meeting of the Estates General, adopted a partial repudiation, as his last resource, Louis abandoned him and turned in despair to Necker, as the only man who could restore public confidence. But it was now too late; the time for reform was gone. Complete reconstruction of the state was now the only course. The demand for the Estates General was heard on every side; the hatred of the populace toward the court was openly manifested; it was thought to be unsafe for the queen to be seen on the streets of Paris; disturbances, almost insurrections, had broken out in various parts of France. The current became too strong to resist, and the call was issued, summoning the Estates General to meet in May, 1789—a confession of failure on the part of the king, an appeal to an instrument of government which his ancestors had thrown out of use, in the interest of the absolute monarchy, two centuries before, and as they thought forever.

From the point of view of the absolute monarchy the calling of the Estates General was a grave mistake. It was in complete contradiction to the theory of the state

which had been the only theory in France for more than a hundred years. It was an appeal to the people to help the state in its difficulties. But such an appeal could be made only on some such theory as that on which the English government was founded, that the final authority and responsibility belong to the people. In France, however, since the middle of the seventeenth century, the state had been conducted wholly on the theory that the king does everything for the people under a responsibility only to God, and that the duty of the people is to submit like children to a father. The appeal to the nation to come to the help of the king was an abandonment of this theory ; it was a confession that the king was not equal to his task ; and it was an acknowledgment of the right of the people to take an effective part in their own government. Logically the calling of the Estates together involved all the changes that the Revolution made in the government of France.

An abandonment of the theory of the absolute monarchy.

It logically involved the changes which followed.

This virtual abdication of the monarchy shows the spot of fatal weakness in the old French theory of paternal government when it is carried out in practice. What was needed in 1789 to save the absolute monarchy in France was not ministers, or knowledge, or the willingness of the people to go on with it longer. It was a king. Everything else would have been found, if France had had a king like Henry IV.—a king of a kind not often found in the history of France, or of any country, to choose and to stand behind the ministers. It was the weak, perplexed, unsettled mind of Louis XVI., not able to follow any policy with vigor or constancy, that destroyed the old government.

The theory failed from lack of a king.

CHAPTER XV.

CAUSES OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

France was
ready for
revolution.

See Lowell,
"Eve of the
French Revolution";
Taine, "The Ancient
Régime"; and
De Tocqueville,
"The Old
Régime."

THE Estates General, when it met, carried France on at once and with rapid steps into the Revolution. All the conditions were prepared for a great change: the universal public belief that the situation was entirely hopeless under the old system; the new ideas which were to furnish plans and purpose to the innovators; the leaders thoroughly indoctrinated with the reigning theories, and of a most determined spirit. When the monarchy confessed its inability to make the necessary reforms and appealed to the nation for assistance, the representatives of the nation were fully prepared not merely to carry through the reforms, but also to push the government's abdication of control to its farthest limits. It is not strange that the stages of the Revolution succeed one another with such rapidity.

Purpose of
this chapter.

The French Revolution deserves the name more truly, for its completeness and suddenness, than any other revolution in history. It is also one of the most profound events of history and the most deserving of study, both for the insight which its coming on gives us into the working of the influences which make history and for the immense importance of the results which followed from it both for France and for the whole world. It is not possible in a brief sketch to give a complete account of the preparation for the Revolution, and this chapter will not attempt to do more than to indicate as clearly as may be the classes of influences

which produced the result and their general character, both to make the main current seem plain and to classify the details of further reading.

The special fact to be accounted for is not the fact of change—that was inevitable. It is the profound and far-reaching character of the change ; that the foundations on which the nation had been building for so many centuries should be so nearly torn to pieces and built over anew. The French Revolution is not a revolution of the same kind as the English Revolution of 1688, or the American Revolution of 1776. These were crises in which the nation appealed to revolutionary means in order to sweep out of the way obstacles to their natural development. The revolution restored the nation to the line of growth which its history had marked out. The French Revolution did the opposite. The situation at the beginning of 1789 was the logical outcome of the past history of France. The absolute monarchy and the theory of the state upon which it rested ; the nobility and the extravagant court, maintained at the public expense and guarded by caste distinctions and privileges ; the old church, officered and conducted as a state institution ; the old religious, intellectual, and educational ideas ; the old system of taxation and expenditure—all these had grown into their eighteenth century forms through a long past. In a single generation they were swept away. The French Revolution suddenly threw the nation out of the groove in which it had been running for centuries into a new one, in which, with some inevitable unsteadiness, it has been running ever since, and this is true notwithstanding the fact that so much which belonged to the old *régime* has been preserved in the France even of to-day.

The reason for this extreme character of the French

The Revolution not like Anglo-Saxon revolutions.

It changed profoundly the fundamental ideas of the state.

Revolution can be found only by taking into account the whole situation—some elements of it active forces, causal agents so to speak, others merely furnishing opportunity or direction to the acting forces. In such an account two preliminary facts must be noticed which are of the greatest importance because they underlie all the others and furnish on the one side impulse and on the other direction to all that occurred. The first of these is the fact that all classes in France of whatever position had become convinced of the necessity of change. The demand for change was universal. Reforms must be made. And this feeling was, in a great measure, as characteristic of those who had the most to lose by the changes which were finally made as of those who had the most to gain. The underlying fact of the preparation for the Revolution in the eighteenth century is the steadily growing conviction of the nation that far-reaching reforms must be made.

Universal belief that reform was necessary.

The other fact is that the nation had had no experience in managing its own affairs. It had had no training in carrying through reforms, or in making constitutions, or in conducting the details of government. It had no practical knowledge to guide it, or we may say that it did not know exactly what it wanted or how to get it. Theories and speculative philosophy had so much greater influence upon public affairs in France, at the close of the eighteenth century, than upon England or the United States because of this difference between the histories of the two peoples. The Declaration of Independence starts out with a little French theorizing but it quickly settles down into one of the sharpest and most business-like of all the Anglo-Saxon constitutional documents. France took the theories for practical guides because she had no others, and

The nation had had no experience in making reforms.

It was therefore dependent upon theories.

experimented long upon them before she accumulated that fund of experience which contributes so much to the security of the present French Republic. There are then these two preliminary facts to be kept in mind in all study of the character of the French Revolution : the nation was determined that reforms should be made, it had no practical experience to guide it in making them.

The most decisive of the influences which produced the Revolution may be classified under the following heads : first, the financial situation of the government ; second, the economic condition of the country ; third, the system of glaring and extreme inequalities constantly maintained in practice ; fourth, the intellectual movement of the century ; fifth, the influence of England and of the American Revolution ; and sixth, the resulting fact that the resisting power of the government and of the privileged classes was undermined by their own consciousness of the need of reforming the state.

The causes
classified.

The financial situation of the government has already been described in detail in recounting the events which led to the calling of the Estates General. It remains to point out that the influence which led to the Revolution from this source was not the burden of the taxes but the utter hopelessness of the nation of any real reform to be expected from the government. France could have borne the burden if there had been any prospect that things would grow better, that the court would practice economy and the officials act with fairness and honesty, that the income would be more carefully expended and the deficit reduced. But everything that happened in the last part of the period tended to fix more firmly in the public mind the conviction that no real reforms were to be expected from the government as it existed. If one minister began an arrangement for paying off the

The financial
cause.

Not the amount
of taxes.

But the
financial
administration.

debt his successor used up the fund in current expenses ; if a genuine reformer got office for a while it very soon became evident that he must fail for lack of support ; if a minister attempted to win the confidence of the nation by publishing a budget it soon turned out to be a mere

trick. It was clear before 1789 that the nation must undertake itself the necessary reforms. But among all the causes of the Revolution this was the one which opened the way for the others to act. If the government could have made both ends meet, stopped the deficit, and held out to the country the prospect of lighter burdens, there would



BEAUVAIS TAPESTRY.
Sofa of the Louis Sixteenth style.

Especially
the difficulty
of economy.

have been no need of the meeting of the Estates General and no revolution. It was the impossibility of practicing economy which gave the Revolution its opportunity to begin.

Nor can the economic condition of France be con-

sidered one of the active causes of the Revolution. The eighteenth century was probably on the whole a period of economic improvement in France and of considerable accumulation of wealth. The Napoleonic wars show the nation in possession of a very large reserve fund of resources and this must have been laid up since the period of exhaustion which closed the reign of Louis XIV. In comparison with most of the countries of Europe also France seems to have been no worse off and in many respects more prosperous. The condition of some of the provinces, especially of those which had in their own hands the management of their taxes, excited the admiration of foreign travelers. And yet there were very widespread hardship and misery throughout the country districts of France, and the economic condition of the country, both in regard to the production of wealth and the comfort of the people, was far below what it should have been, whether judged by the condition of scarcely more favorably situated countries, like England, or by the nation's own natural resources and knowledge of how to improve them.

The economic condition of France

not the worst possible,

but below what it ought to have been.

In many parts of France the peasants lived almost like animals. The land produced only a few fold the seed sown. A scanty harvest produced a local famine, not of infrequent occurrence, and the surplus of a neighboring province could not be brought to its relief because of impassable roads or vexatious government regulations. Large tracts of land lay entirely waste and the state offered rewards for its restoration to cultivation. The wretched food of the peasant even in the best times and the burden of his labors made him prematurely old. This was especially true of the women. Arthur Young records his thinking a certain peasant woman to be sixty or seventy years old who

The peasant class suffered the most severely.

A loss of men
and resources.

proved to be twenty-eight. This meant of course that France was not merely leaving a considerable part of her natural resources undeveloped but also that she was getting far less from her men in life and services than she should have had. However great the reserve resources of the nation may have been in the Napoleonic wars they were much less than they should have been. This state



A COUNTRY PHARMACY.

An exact representation of the chamber of Michel Schappert, a peasant of Berne, who became famous throughout Europe for his medical skill.

But manufac-
tures were also
involved.

of things acted economically also in another direction. The purchasing power of the peasant was reduced because his own earnings were so small, and consequently the market for French manufactured goods was limited and the opportunity for a further development of manufactures slight.

For this condition of things the financial methods of

the government were mainly responsible. The exemptions, legal and illegal, possessed by the upper classes, put the main burden of the taxation on the laboring class, and the method of collection made any improvement in the condition of the individual almost impossible. As a recent French historian has said, the peasant suffered greater misery from the pressure of the royal government than he had in earlier times from the anarchy of the feudal system or of the religious civil wars. Even the prosperous peasant did not dare to live well or to buy comforts or luxuries for fear that his taxes would be increased, or that he would be held responsible for the deficit of his poorer neighbor. To the pressure of the government must be added also that of the nobility. The loss of their feudal political power had not carried with it the loss of their feudal rights over the land. These remained in numerous personal services due from the peasant, *corvées* of many kinds, and in small payments in money or in kind for the land which the peasant tilled even though he might be the actual owner of it. These rights were of little real value to the lords, but they were extremely vexatious to the cultivator and interfered in many ways with his freedom of production.

The government responsible.

The nobility shares the responsibility.

In leading to the Revolution this state of things acted much as the financial condition of the country did. There was a consciousness that the misery of the laboring class was greater than it need be; that other countries enjoyed a greater prosperity; that the government was mainly responsible for the suffering which prevailed; and that if a crowd of abuses could be done away with full prosperity might be restored and France put where it ought to be. But with these ideas went also the conviction that the government could

The result, a strong demand for change.

never be expected to remove these abuses ; that if the changes imperatively demanded were to be made the reform must strike first at the government itself. So that in this direction again the result of whatever thinking was done upon the subject was the conclusion that reforms must be made but that the first obstacle to be removed was the government.

Inequalities.

Far more important as one of the active causes of the Revolution was the universal prevalence of the most glaring and galling inequalities. We may almost go so far as to say that the old *régime*, as a practical system, as a working government machine, was based upon a multitude of caste distinctions, exemptions, and privileges, that it worked by means of them, and that it could not destroy them and introduce equality of privilege without tearing itself to pieces. It seems peculiar to an Anglo-Saxon that the French Revolution put such tremendous emphasis on the idea of equality ; that it did not center everything in the idea of liberty, as we should, but added to this, in its famous rallying cry, its statement of the fundamental and indispensable rights of society, two other terms, which are in reality synonyms, equality and fraternity. But if we once realize the great number and the open injustice of the inequalities that prevailed under the system which the Revolution destroyed, it becomes no longer strange. The Frenchman in 1789 had a far keener sense of the necessity for equality in a free state than the Englishman or the American could have had at any time in his history.

*Liberté, égalité,
fraternité.*

It is not possible to illustrate in this place these inequalities, as might be done, by examples from every department of life ; inequalities in rights, in privileges, in duties, in burdens, in opportunities of all sorts, in social distinctions not important in themselves but often

s, in the practical operation of 'the
most important of all, in the distribu-
Let us take as one example the mili-
e common practice for a long time had
ons in the army to nobles, but by no
ception. Until at least the middle of
entury the plebeian petty officer might
ommission, and to obtain further pro-
be ennobled for distinguished services.
practice became more exclusive and
he practice, so that, after 1781, no

Inequalities in
the army.

— could gain a commission without proving to the
satisfaction of the king's genealogist four generations of
noble descent. Even a non-military people would feel
the injustice of such a distinction, much more so the
French.

Of the inequalities of taxation, the poll-tax will serve
as an example. In theory it was a kind of income
tax to be paid by all classes, noble and commoner
alike, in proportion to their incomes. In practice it
was anything but that. In the Ile de France, on
an income of 240 livres, the commoner paid twenty-one
livres tax and the noble eight. In ten provinces of
France the privileged classes paid only one eighth as
much as the non-privileged. In the practical operation
of all the other taxes it was the same, with the general
result, well known to all the French people, that the
heaviest burdens were unfairly and often illegally placed
on those least able to bear them. Socially, imagine the
effect upon the feelings of those ambitious of such dis-
tinctions of the regulation adopted by the king in 1760,
forbidding any woman to be presented at court, or any
man to enter the royal carriages or to follow the king in
the chase, who could not prove before the king's geneal-

Of taxation.

Taine, "The
Ancient
Régime," p. 364.

In society.

ogist the possession of three noble titles each on his father's and on his mother's side, going back to 1400.

It was, however, the inequalities in taxation, with the general belief that if all the property of the kingdom were fairly taxed the financial difficulties of the government would be over, that gave rise to the strongest feeling that sweeping changes must be made.

Probably the most decisive of any single set of causes in leading to the Revolution was the intellectual, because it supplied argument, and guiding theories, and intense

conviction, and, not the least important, sentimental motives. The philosophy of the eighteenth century, by carrying conviction with it, did more than all else to undermine the resistance of the classes who would be most naturally opposed to a revolution. Going back for its origin to the great scientific age of the seventeenth century, which convinced the thinking world of the reign of law in the physical universe and introduced, as does every age of great scientific advance, a general critical spirit, the intellectual movement of the eighteenth



VOLTAIRE.

Born in Paris, February 20, 1694. Died May 30, 1778.*

Intellectual
causes.

Destructive
criticism.

century is especially one of destructive criticism. It attacked, with a bitterness which surprises us, all sorts of cherished beliefs and old abuses wherever it found them, in church, or state, or society. Neither the church nor the government was able to restrain it and they finally abandoned the attempt.

This spirit of the age was incarnate in Voltaire. It

Voltaire.
was the completeness and the vigor of the expression which he gave to the prevailing spirit, far more than any literary skill of his, that gave him his commanding position in the century. Drawing the spirit from the fountain head in England, profoundly impressed by all that he saw there in contrast with the state of things in France, he came back to the Continent to wage unceasing but undis-



JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU.
Born in Geneva, 1712. Died 1778.

criminating war upon everything belonging to the old régime. Men of all classes read and were convinced.

But the philosophy of the eighteenth century was not destructive alone. Especially after the middle of the century it assumed forms which, though purely theoretical, may be called distinctly constructive. Of this phase of the movement, Rousseau is the best

Rousseau.

His theories.

type. He brought into vogue a fundamental theory of the state—the social contract theory—which gave in the minds of his contemporaries a solid foundation for the belief that the people should control the government, and he attached to it a mass of plausible theorizing about natural rights which so profoundly impressed the French people that when they once got possession of power they thought that if they could make the state conform to these theories all evils would disappear. He set in motion also a sentimental, but very effective, influence, in making men long for a “return to nature.” Voltaire proved the necessity, Rousseau furnished the motive force for the Revolution.

The example of England.

In another way England acted upon France, in addition to her influence through the channel of speculative philosophy. The French writers who sought a temporary refuge in England found there a freedom of thought and of speech of which they had not dreamed in France. They found also a free government in which the king and the court were not absolute, but in which a national legislature controlled the state and determined who should be the ministers, and under which public burdens were borne by all classes alike. When they returned to France they proclaimed the discovery which they had made. This was especially true of

Montesquieu.

Montesquieu. His “*Spirit of the Laws*,” in which he described the English constitution, went through twenty-two editions in eighteen months. The English constitution did not excite the admiration of the French to such an extent as to induce them to borrow English institutions after the Revolution had begun. They did this only after some experimenting of their own. But it gave them a living example of the results which they

might hope to reach, if they could first make the government over. To this may be added the influence of our own country after 1776. The French interest in the American Revolution was not merely due to the opportunity which it offered to take vengeance upon England, but also to the fact that here were liberty and equality, and that we seemed to realize their ideals of primitive simplicity and nearness to nature, and the success of the new republic strengthened the belief in the possibility of bringing on in France also such a golden age.

America.



MONTESQUIEU.

Born January 18, 1689. Died February 10, 1755.

The result of all these influences working together was a more or less conscious conviction on the part of many in the privileged classes that their position was indefensible—a conviction which became itself an important element of the situation when the Revolution opened. That the Marquis de La Fayette was led by his sympathy with a people struggling for liberty to abandon everything to go to their aid, and that the Marquis de Mirabeau offered himself as a candidate for the Estates General to the electors of the third estate and became a leader of the Revolution, are only striking instances of a general tendency. That the privileged orders could have prevented the Revolution by a united and determined resistance is not certain. Their half-hearted defense of

The privileged classes half revolutionists.

their ground and their more than half sentimental sympathy with the cause of their enemies made the success of the Revolution certain.

The Revolution
not due to the
form, but to the
abuses of the
government.

The French Revolution, like every other profound event in history, was the product of a great complexity of causes. Those which appear to be the determining ones are not those which are necessarily connected with any form of government, but rather with abuses in the old *régime* which were due to the peculiar historical conditions out of which the French absolute monarchy grew.

CHAPTER XVI.

TEN YEARS OF REVOLUTION.

THE calling of the Estates General together was, as has been said, a virtual abdication of the absolute monarchy and an abandonment of the theory on which the state had been conducted for nearly two hundred years. But it was not necessarily revolutionary. The Revolution was brought on by the action of the third estate, and the progress of events shows us how thoroughly prepared they were for this action. The rapidity with which one step succeeds another from the first session of the Estates until the Revolution was fully under way is almost incredible.

The calling of the Estates General did not necessarily mean revolution.

See H. Morse Stephens, "Europe, 1789-1815"; and Rose, "Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era."

The meeting was opened on the 5th of May. In the elections the third estate had been allowed to elect two representatives from each district from which each of the other two elected one. This gave them half the votes of the combined estates, but it did not decide the question of voting in one house or in three. Historically the Estates General had always acted in three houses, each estate by itself. There was no precedent for any other organization. But if each order voted by itself, it would render the numbers of the third estate of no value, and make it hopeless to attempt any thorough reforms.

1789.

The question of voting in one house or in three.

This question then gave rise to the first crisis. In one direction lay reform and revolution, in the other a little longer delay of the inevitable reckoning. The third estate was well led and it was determined not to

The third estate determined.

yield. It refused to organize itself as a separate estate and called upon the other two to join it in a single assembly. This they refused to do, but the third estate resolutely declined to do business on the old plan of organization. For more than a month this deadlock continued, and very naturally the other orders were slow to yield. This demand of the third estate in itself alone meant revolution. This fact should be clearly understood. In throwing aside the historical form and seizing upon a new and hitherto unknown form in order to accomplish a result which they could not otherwise bring about, the third estate entered upon the path of revolution, and by acceding to their demand the other two estates accepted the principle that revolutionary means might be employed. This first step was the slow and difficult one. All the rest followed easily and rapidly.

This involved the question of revolution.

The third estate determines to ignore the other two.

On the 10th of June, the third estate sent an ultimatum to the nobles and clergy, and resolved, if this failed, to constitute themselves an assembly and to legislate without regard to the others. It was refused, and on June 16 the third estate declared themselves the National Assembly of France, and voted to abolish all existing forms of taxation. This brought matters to a crisis, and Louis determined to interfere himself. To prepare the hall for this royal session, it was closed against the deputies, who then assembled in the Tennis Court at Versailles in great excitement and took a solemn oath not to separate until they had given France a new constitution. Two days later they were joined by more than half the deputies of the clergy. The elections among the clergy had sent to the meeting a very large number of parish priests and minor clergy who sympathized much more with the third estate than with the

Deputies of the clergy join them.

higher ranks of their own order. These men now openly reënforced the revolutionary party.

The next day, June 23, the royal session was held. Louis declared that "of his own goodness and generosity" he would take no more taxes from the people unless voted by their representatives, but he directed the deputies to meet and vote as three houses and to consider only questions of finance, and especially not to meddle with the privileges of the orders. But it was already too late for the king to try to get back upon the theory that he had the right to issue what orders he pleased and that every one in the state must obey without questioning. He had himself fatally abandoned it and the third estate had taken too firm a position upon the opposite theory of the supremacy of the people. When the king's master of ceremonies called out to the Assembly, "You hear, gentlemen, the orders of the king," Mirabeau made answer, "Go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and that we shall be removed only at the point of the bayonet." This was a square issue, not between the third estate and the other two highly privileged estates, but between the third estate and the king, between the theory of the absolute monarchy and that of the sovereignty of the people. Which would yield?

It was at this point that the personal character of Louis became an important link in the chain of events. He was a good man and he greatly desired to be a good king—a real father to his people. He felt the justice, also, of many of the complaints which had been allowed to reach him. If left to himself he would naturally have been inclined to reforms and to changes, and no very obstinate clinging to an absolute king's prerogatives would have stood in the way. But there was a strong

The king joins issue with the third estate.

The third estate accepts the conflict.

The king's character a factor in the Revolution.

The court
party.

party at the court, headed by the queen and by Louis's brother, the Comte d'Artois, who was bitterly opposed to any yielding, and Louis was weak and easily influenced. The consequence was the worst possible for the monarchy and the most favorable for an extreme revolution. Louis resisted at one moment with great vigor until he had clearly staked his rights upon the

result, and then he suddenly yielded in such a way as to sacrifice entirely the principle involved, and yet to gain nothing from his compliance, because he seemed to yield to force after the issue had been squarely drawn.



LOUIS XVI.

King of France. Born 1754. Married Marie Antoinette 1770. King 1774. Guillotined January 21, 1793.

So it was in the present case. The attitude of the third estate was as uncompromising after they had received the commands of the king as before.

"You are to-day what you were yesterday," cried Siéyès, and Louis yielded. At his request the majority of the deputies of the nobles joined the National Assembly and that body was made complete. In doing this both the nobles and the king accepted the principle which the third estate had insisted upon, that reforms and changes should be made without regard to historic precedents or

The king and
the nobles
yield to the
firmness of the
third estate.

vested rights. Or, in other words, the government and all the orders had accepted the principle of revolution. If the king had had the strength of purpose to abide by the consequences faithfully, the final result would have been very different.

Immediately the National Assembly began the work of forming a constitution for France, of transforming a century-long absolutism—a state which had never been anything else indeed—into a limited monarchy by a paper constitution, and they appointed a committee to formulate the fundamental principles to be followed in the new government. But within a few days Louis was persuaded that he had made a great mistake in not compelling the third estate to yield by force if necessary, and he began to concentrate regiments of troops in the neighborhood of Paris. Military force the Assembly could not hope to resist, but their spirit was unchanged. On July 9, under the lead of Mirabeau, they adopted an address to the king asking that the troops be removed and professing their loyalty to his person. Louis must go farther before he yielded. He suggested to the Assembly that Soissons would be a good place for their meeting if they were afraid of the troops, and dismissed Necker from his ministry and ordered him to leave France.

Constitution
making begun.

Louis changes
again.

Necker dis-
missed.

This act brought upon the scene a new force which was to be one of the strongest forces of the early Revolution—the Parisian mob. Necker's rather undeserved popularity has already been referred to, and now his dismissal seemed to announce the king's complete adoption of a reactionary policy. The mob which broke into fury and raged through the streets and gardens of Paris on the receipt of the news did at first no particular damage. On the next day, July 13, the electors who had been

The beginning
of mob vio-
lence.

Paris revolutionized.

chosen to select the deputies of Paris to the Estates General, constituted themselves a permanent municipal organization for Paris in place of the old government. Such a government of course had no legal existence. It was revolutionary. But it was quickly recognized by all

the citizens as the only government of Paris. Its first task was to organize a civic militia for the protection of property in the city—the beginning of the National Guards. On the same day the king's troops were withdrawn from Paris and on the 14th the mob stormed the Bastille, which stood in a way as a symbol of the old *régime*, and murdered the officer in command together with the provost of the merchants who represented the old government of Paris, and some others.



MARIE ANTOINETTE.

Queen of France. Born 1755. Daughter of the empress Maria Louisa. Married Louis, dauphin of France, 1770. Guillotined 1793.

The Bastille stormed.

presented the old government of Paris, and some others.

"A revolt," exclaimed Louis, when they told him of these events. "No, sire," said the duke of Liancourt, "it is a revolution," and a revolution Louis was not yet ready for. He was brought again to the point of yielding. In person and without his guards he went to the

Louis yields again.

Assembly, and promised to send away the troops and to recall Necker. He was received with great enthusiasm and escorted back to the palace by the whole Assembly. On the next day he entered Paris in the same way, escorted by wildly applauding crowds. He recognized the new government of the city, sanctioned the organization of the National Guards, of which La Fayette was appointed commander, and assumed the tricolor cockade. His second attempt at stemming the tide had lasted just long enough to make it gather greater force and sweep him further out to sea. The Comte d'Artois and the irreconcilable nobles recognized the fact and fled from France at once.

And makes concessions.

The emigration begins.

In the mean time the Revolution had spread throughout France. Other cities had followed the example of Paris and had organized new municipal governments entirely under citizen control, and the peasants, believing that the time of complete emancipation had come, were refusing to meet their feudal obligations any longer and in many places had risen in arms and sacked the castles and châteaux, mainly for the purpose of destroying the written records of their dues. The National Assembly had no choice but to accept these results, even if it had wished to do otherwise. On the night of the 4th of August occurred the famous and theatrical session of the Assembly in which the deputies of the nobles and clergy one after another, amid the greatest excitement, renounced for themselves their feudal rights and peculiar privileges, and the reign of equality was legally inaugurated.

Revolution spreads.

Feudalism destroyed.

From the 5th of May to the 5th of August was three months, and in these three months France had been revolutionized. The third estate had planted itself firmly on its right, as representing the people, to destroy the

The work of three months.

old institutions of the state and to introduce new ones, and it had forced the king and the two privileged orders to recognize this right. The cities of France had actually overturned their old governments and had set up new ones which were in full operation. A citizen army had been organized. All the odious caste distinctions of the old *régime* had been swept out of existence, and the laws of unequal taxation, and now the Assembly was hard at work upon the construction of an entirely new constitution for the state. The progress of events for the future was not so rapid as in these introductory days, but it continued in the same spirit.

The work of constitution making.

The work of forming the new constitution was a slow one. The proper definition of certain abstract terms seemed to the French of that age a thing of vital importance,* and the discussion of some points of detail, many of them of no great practical moment, occupied many months. Early in October it began to be feared that the king was yielding again to the influences at the court which were hostile to reform, and a great mob from Paris invaded the gardens and palace at Versailles. The king was saved from the mob by the National Guard, but he was obliged to follow the advice of La Fayette and take up his residence, with his family, in Paris. Here the party of revolution could keep him under watch almost as if he were a hostage for the conduct of the opposite party. On the 14th of July, 1790,

The king forced to reside in Paris.

* The feeling of the French in regard to the importance of theory and the carelessness of their statements may be seen from the following introductory sentence of the Constitution of 1793. The translation is that published by Lieber in his "Civil Liberty," Appendix XI.: "The French people, convinced that oblivion and contempt of the natural rights of man are the only causes of calamities in the world, has resolved to explain these sacred and inalienable rights in a solemn declaration, that all citizens, by comparing always the acts of the government with the whole social union, may never suffer themselves to be oppressed and dishonored by tyranny; that the people may always have before its eyes the fundamental pillars of its liberty and welfare, and the authorities the standard of their duties, and the legislator the object of his problem."

the anniversary of the taking of the Bastile was celebrated in Paris with great popular rejoicing and by the so-called federation of all the national guards of France. The king was obliged to take part in the festivities and to swear publicly that he would faithfully observe the new constitution. In June, 1791, the king and his family attempted secretly to escape from Paris and to join the exiles and enemies of the Revolution abroad, but the attempt was a failure and they were brought back to Paris still more nearly prisoners than before. This act of the king's had a double influence upon future events. It convinced the extreme revolutionist party that Louis was not to be trusted, and it tended to strengthen their hands by exciting a similar feeling among those who had been more moderate in their demands, and outside France it revealed to the monarchs and statesmen of other countries more clearly than before the true condition of things in France.

He attempts flight.

The new constitution was finished in September, 1791, and accepted by the king, and on the 30th the Assembly, now called the Constituent Assembly, was dissolved. Two changes made by this Assembly, besides those already mentioned, had a most decisive influence upon the future of France.

The Assembly finishes its labors.

By one of these changes the old provinces of France were done away with, and the territory of the nation was divided into eighty-three new departments without any reference to the old boundary lines. With the provinces went also the old provincial names, the new ones being taken from geographical features of the locality ; the old local liberties and special privileges, the most important of which had been surrendered on the night of the 4th of August ; the custom-houses along the interior provincial lines ; and everything which remained to remind one of

See map at end of the book.

The provinces abolished.

the way in which France had been constructed territorially, by a series of annexations to the royal domain, each coming in upon terms of its own. Nothing better could have been devised for cutting off the nation from its past, for wiping out all traces of local or feudal patriotism or jealousy, and for making all equally citizens of the one nation, Frenchmen henceforth, and not Gascons or Normans. This subdivision of France has remained to the present time with only minor changes. With it went a transformation of the machinery of local government, making all the responsible officers elective.

Local government also transformed.

The other change concerned the national finances and involved the reconstruction of the national church. Necker had done nothing more after than before the meeting of the Estates General to justify his popularity as a finance minister. His loans could not be floated, and the brilliant idea of a patriotic contribution by the people of one fourth of their incomes, adopted by the Assembly, proved of no real assistance. Finally a plan was hit upon, theoretically very promising and easily adopted, and which certainly had the merit of postponing a real solution of the difficulty to some future date. In the debates on the renunciations on the night of the 4th of August, some representatives of the clergy, to avoid so sweeping a renunciation, had incautiously planted themselves on the principle that the endowment lands of the church had been given them in trust by the nation and that they could be deprived of them only by an act of the nation itself.

Financial measures.

The Assembly was not slow to act upon this admission when the occasion arose. In November, 1789, it was decreed that the lands of the church were at the disposition of the nation. In December it was voted to issue paper money to the value of 400,000,000

The church lands confiscated.

francs, secured upon these lands and to be received by the state in payment for them, the government being authorized to sell them at auction to the value of the paper money issued. This was the origin of the famous French currency, based upon the value of the national land, the *assignats*. It shared the usual fate of theoretical currencies. The temptation to keep on manufacturing money so easily produced was too great to resist

The *assignats*.

in the continued financial straits of the state. Finally, in 1794, it was declared that the government was turning out 100,000,000 per day and not keeping up with the necessary expenses at



FACSIMILE OF AN ASSIGNAT. Reduced.

that. The depreciation became so great that 400 francs had only the purchasing power of one franc. The most radical measures were finally necessary to relieve the financial burden, and in 1799 two thirds of the national debt was repudiated. The remaining one third formed the basis of the present national debt of France.

The confiscation of the endowments of the church made necessary a new provision for the clergy. In July, 1790, the decrees were adopted reorganizing the church and forming what was called the civil constitution of the clergy. The old bishoprics were all abolished and new ones made to correspond with the civil de-

The civil constitution of the clergy.

The clergy to
be state officers.

partments. Bishops and priests were to be elected officers, to hold their offices legally without the consent of the pope, and to be paid their salaries by the state. In a word, the church was made a part of the government machine and the clergy put on the footing of the other public officers. King, pope, and clergy resisted this arrangement so far as they could, but without avail to change it. Later in the year the "ecclesiastical public functionaries" were required to take an oath to maintain the constitution and especially the civil constitution of the clergy. Very many of the old clergy refused to take this oath and were supported in their refusal by the sympathies of a large part of the people. One of the elements of weakness in all the governments which came before Napoleon was this divided condition of the church, the public church supported by a fraction of the nation, and the private or secret church thought to be persecuted and strong in its influence over the larger portion of the population. This arrangement continued with some modification and fluctuation until 1801, when Napoleon made his concordat with the pope. By this the Catholic Church was restored more nearly to the position in which it stood before the Revolution, but without its endowments, with only small salaries from the state, and not as a recognized established church.

The church and
the nation
divided.

Summary of
results.

The privileged classes, the absolute monarchy, and the old local governments, the historic geography of France, and the historic national church, all had been entirely reconstructed within a year. Not much was left of the old France. The nation was cutting itself loose from its history, and starting upon a new and untried road, guided largely by theory and by passion. It is not strange that so clear a mind as Mirabeau's saw that the movement which he had done so much to in-

augurate was full of danger for the future, nor that the number of the voluntary exiles, the *émigrés*, was constantly growing, nor that other countries were watching the progress of events in alarm and seriously considering the necessity of interfering to undo the work of the Revolution as a matter of self-defense. This influence from without, the danger which threatened from the combination of the *émigrés* and the hostile foreign powers, was probably the strongest single influence in determining the course of events during the next five years.

Mirabeau's fears.

Pressure from without.



The Legislative Assembly.

MIRABEAU.

Born March 9, 1749. Died April 2, 1791.

The Constituent Assembly was dissolved on September 30, and the new Legislative Assembly, under the constitution, met on the 1st of October, 1791.

The electors had been forbidden to choose for members of the new body any who had served in the old, so that it was composed of men without legislative experience, and it showed itself easily influenced by eloquence and passion. At first it was under the lead of Girondists, constitutionalists or moderate Republicans, but the party of the extreme Radicals, the Jacobins, was growing in strength. The enemies of the Revolution abroad, by their ill-advised words and acts, did as much for the cause of the extreme democrats in Paris as these did themselves.

Two parties.

Early in 1792 the German emperor definitely refused

War is begun.

to interfere with the plans of the *émigrés* who were collecting troops in the Rhine Valley, and on the 20th of April France declared war against Austria. This involved also a war with Prussia, which was in close alliance with Austria, with this special contingency in view. It was the opening of the wars of the Revolution, which go on from this time with scarcely a break till the battle of Waterloo and the final fall of Napoleon.

It goes against France.

The war opened disastrously. The old and experienced officers were among the *émigrés*. The soldiers were raw levies of a spirit not submitting readily to discipline. Everywhere the enemy advanced, and the French armies fled in wild panic and murdered their officers as if they were responsible. Paris was filled with alarm, and began to believe, not without some evidence, that the king was secretly trying to aid the threatened invasion. Just at this moment, Louis vetoed an act of the Assembly for the collection of a military force at Paris, and turned the Girondist ministry out of office. This was enough for the mob, who stormed the Tuileries where the king was residing and forced upon his head the red cap of the extreme revolutionists.

The king held responsible.

Brunswick's manifesto.

At this time, the mob contented itself with this result, but the Austrians and Prussians on the news resolved to strike at once. The duke of Brunswick, in command of the main invading army, issued a manifesto threatening the people of Paris and France in the most exasperating terms. The excitement and national enthusiasm aroused were extreme, and the radical democrats rapidly availed themselves of it to carry the Revolution further. The government of Paris was made over in their interest, and another mob, more violent and determined, assailed the Tuileries. This was the insurrection of the 10th of August, 1792. Louis and his family fled to the As-

sembly and were given a refuge in the gallery, while the king's guards bravely and vainly defended the palace with their lives. It was the end of the monarchy. Under the dictation of the victorious mob, the Assembly voted the suspension of the king from all his powers and the election of a convention, since under the constitution the Assembly itself had no power to make constitutional changes. The king was removed from the Assembly to prison in the Temple.

The king is suspended and imprisoned.

The men who now took possession of power acted with the greatest energy. Defense was everywhere organized. Paris was garrisoned. New levies were made. The enthusiasm of the people was aroused. That the Revolution had passed into a new stage, where it could no longer be supported by many of its earlier friends, can easily be seen from the fact that La Fayette now threw up his command and abandoned France. But in spite of the new enthusiasm the enemy continued to advance. It seemed as if nothing could save Paris, and in rage and fear the mob burst open the prisons and murdered hundreds of the prisoners who had been arrested after the suspension of the king. Before the month closed the advance of the Prussians was checked at the battle of Valmy. It was not a decisive victory, but the Prussians were jealous of the Austrians and fell back toward the frontier. The democratic revolution was saved for the moment.

A new stage of the Revolution.

The massacres of September 2d and 3d, 1792.

On the same day with the battle of Valmy, the National Convention, elected to decide the question of monarchy or republic, began its work. On the second day it unanimously declared France a republic. But here its unanimity ceased. Three parties at once declared themselves. On the right were the Girondists, the party of moderation. On the left were the Jacobins,

The Convention.

Three parties.

the extreme Radicals, called "the Mountain" from the high benches which they occupied. In the center sat the undecided or vacillating, or those who were waiting to see which way the tide would run, called "the Plain," or more contemptuously, "the Marsh." At the beginning the Girondists had control of the Convention.

French successes.

Now the tide of war seemed to favor the new republic. On all the frontiers the invaders were driven back, and foreign soil was occupied. Especially was this true on the northeast. The middle Rhine fell into the hands of the French and all Belgium was conquered. The plans of Louis XIV. seemed about to be realized. But it is harder for a government which is based on popular enthusiasm to deal with success than with failure, and the republic went too far. The Convention declared the river Scheldt open to free navigation, contrary to all treaties, thus announcing in effect that they considered the law of nature, of which they alone were the interpreters, to be superior to all international law and the obligation of treaties. They adopted the famous declaration of the 19th of November, declaring in effect their mission to revolutionize all governments in the interest of their particular sort of liberty. They declared Savoy and Belgium annexed to France, and so gave warning that their missionary enterprise in favor of liberty might result in the loss of the independence of their involuntary converts. It is not strange that the states of Europe which had so far stood aloof began to prepare for war. The last argument which was needed to convince them was speedily furnished by the execution of the king.

The revolutionary propaganda.

"Let us throw them the head of a king," said Danton.

The death of Louis was not a part of the Girondist program. It was the demand of the Mountain in order to break completely with the royalists and perhaps to embarrass their opponents in the Convention. The

growing strength of the extreme party is to be seen in the fact that while vigorous leadership would undoubtedly have commanded a majority of the Convention against the execution, the Girondists did not venture to furnish such leadership. The king was sentenced to death by a majority of 49 in a vote of 725.

Louis XVI.
executed
January 21,
1793.

War with almost all Europe followed. England, Holland, Spain, and the German Empire joined the allies. Even many of the minor states declared war, like Portugal, Naples, and Tuscany. This first great coalition against revolutionary France was not brought together by the purpose of restoring the old government in that country, but was moved chiefly by the belief that the party now directing the progress of the Revolution was the enemy of all existing institutions and that unless it could be held by force within bounds every state of Europe would soon suffer the same evils to which France was subject. It was the evidence which the Convention had given that they would be bound by no obligation of law or of justice that had united Europe against them.

War of Europe
upon France.

In the first campaign of the war, the allies in a few weeks drove the French completely out of Belgium, and the commander of the French army, Dumouriez, went over to the enemy. The effect of these disasters upon the Convention, which had expected rapid successes, was to bring it to a conclusion which was destined to great results. It was the conviction to which Mirabeau had come early in the history of the Revolution, but which had not yet been adopted by any party. It was the conclusion that government by unwieldy legislative bodies, which had really been the government of France since the king had been forced to give up any influence upon events, could not be made successful, and that the power must be concentrated in fewer hands, under, it was

The French
defeated.

The first step
toward stronger
government.

intended, a close responsibility to the Convention. It was the first turning from government by tumultuous assemblies toward the one-man despotism of Napoleon—the first step in the way which was to lead through the Reign of Terror to the Directory, the Consulate, and the Empire.

The Committee
of Public Safety.

When the Convention learned of the disasters in Belgium, it elected the first Committee of Public Safety, consisting of nine members, vested with supreme power. The second committee, which governed France for a year, was appointed about three months later. A few days before the election of the first committee, the Revolutionary Tribunal of Paris had been set up for the extraordinary trial and punishment of all persons suspected of being hostile to the new course of events. The machinery was thus prepared for the Reign of Terror.

July 10, 1793.
March 9.

Insurrection of
La Vendée.

One of the measures ordered by the Convention to meet the military crisis was a general conscription to furnish an army of 300,000 men. The attempt to enforce this conscription led to the famous insurrection of La Vendée in western France—an insurrection at first of peasants to avoid the draft, but soon led by nobles and non-juring priests against the new *régime* and aided by the English, it embarrassed the Convention and occupied forces needed elsewhere for many months.

The scene of
Victor Hugo's
"Ninety-
three."

The Girondists
overthrown,
June 2, 1793.

In the mean time the troubles crowding upon France from all directions had naturally embittered party feeling and finally led to a desperate struggle for supremacy, which was decided not by the Convention itself but by the intervention of the Paris Commune. Surrounded by troops, the Convention had no choice but to expel the leaders of the Girondists, and those of them who did not escape were put on trial by the Revolutionary Tribunal. For the first time the entire control of affairs was in the

hands of the extreme party. If at the outset they showed some moderation and issued the Constitution of 1793, which was never put into operation, they drifted rapidly into the Reign of Terror under the influence of the movements which were made during the summer in various parts of France in favor of the Girondists. From September, 1793, to

The Reign of
Terror.

July, 1794, the Convention was almost a cipher, and the Committee of Public Safety and the Revolutionary Tribunal ruled without a check. The story of the Terror is well known. It struck impartially in all directions. Leaders of the early Revolution like Bailly, the first mayor of Paris, demagogues like the duke of Orleans, Philip Égalité, Marie Antoinette, and Ma-



ROBESPIERRE.

Born 1758. Elected to Estates General 1789. Radical democrat. Deputy from Paris to Convention 1792. Chief of the Mountain. President of Committee of Public Safety during Reign of Terror. Guillotined 1794.

dame Roland, finally even its own leaders the Terror destroyed and sent to the guillotine, on the one hand, the Hébertists, the extreme of the extremists of the Paris Commune, and on the other the Dantonists, who were beginning to ask if the Terror had not now served its purpose. For a moment Robespierre seemed to be supreme and could celebrate with éclat his festival of the

Destroyed its
own leaders.

supreme being. But in a few days he too was guillotined and the Commune of Paris was destroyed.

Military re-
organization

While these events were taking place within France the military situation on the frontiers had been everywhere transformed. New armies had been created. Discipline had been carefully restored. Both officers and men had acquired experience. Great pains were taken with arms and supplies. The results were apparent in the campaign at the end of 1793, and those of 1794. The armies were successful in all directions.

and successes.

Belgium was reconquered ; the middle Rhine recovered ; Toulon was retaken from the English—it was here that Bonaparte first distinguished himself—and Italy and Spain were invaded. The disasters which had led to the Reign of Terror had been succeeded by the most encouraging victories. The need for such severity, if it had ever existed, was now past. The Convention gradually recovered control. New men were introduced into the Committee of Public Safety and the executions were stopped. The Reign of Terror really came to an end without any change of the party in power or of the forms of government or of the laws. Later some of its leaders were punished and some laws which had supported it repealed.

The end of the
Reign of Terror.

The Batavian
Republic.

The armies continued to win new successes. Early in 1795, Holland was in the hands of the French, and was made over into the Batavian Republic by the aid of Dutch sympathizers with the Revolution, and the new state joined in close alliance with France. In every other direction the French armies advanced further into the enemies' territories. As the party in power felt itself more secure on account of these continued successes, it became still more liberal, and in March the expelled Girondists were called back to the Convention.

With these changes the control of the Convention shifted and passed finally into the hands of the men who had formed the party of the Moderates during the Reign of Terror, and the remains of the Mountain found themselves excluded from power. The effort of their sympathizers in Paris to revive the time when the Convention was controlled by howling mobs was a complete failure and resulted only in the death or exile of other leaders of the old extreme party. The changed situation in the Convention soon became evident to Europe at large and it began to be understood that the present rulers of the republic entertained no plans of foreign missionary enterprise in the interest of "liberty."

The Moderates
in control.

This opened the way for some of the states—which had had enough of war for the present—to make peace with France. Prussia was influenced also by her dislike of Austria, and the favorite, Godoy, who was all-powerful in Spain, had reasons of his own for wishing peace. On the 5th of April a treaty was made with Prussia on terms very



Treaties of
peace.

LOUIS XVII., THE DAUPHIN.
Died in prison in the Temple, Paris, June 8, 1795.

and the favorite, Godoy, who was all-powerful in Spain, had reasons of his own for wishing peace. On the 5th of April a treaty was made with Prussia on terms very

advantageous to the republic, and in July one with Spain. Others were made at about the same time with some of the smaller states, but England and Austria remained irreconcilable enemies, though the English ministry under Pitt would have been glad to conclude peace if public opinion would have sanctioned it. The war, indeed, had been one of most brilliant successes for the English. The reverses on the Continent had not touched them. They had paid heavy subsidies to their allies, but they had more than repaid themselves at the expense of their enemies. The French fleets had been destroyed, the French West India colonies seized, and, when the Batavian Republic allied itself with France, the great Dutch colonies shared the same fate, the Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, and the rich Spice Islands. The English colonial conquests in this war would make an empire in themselves.

The English
colonial con-
quests.

Two days before the treaty with Prussia was signed, the Convention took the first step toward honestly carrying out the purpose for which it had been elected, in appointing a committee to begin the work of drafting a new constitution for the republic, or perhaps more accurately of giving it a constitution, for the Constitution of 1793 had never been in operation and the republic, since its establishment, had had no constitution of its own. This constitution was much more rapidly drawn up than the first one after the Revolution, that of 1791. The leaders had now experience of some value to draw upon, and they drew upon it to some purpose. The modifications which they made of early revolutionary ideas lie in the direction of institutions which they might have borrowed from England or the United States at the beginning, if they had not been determined to cut out an entirely new way for themselves.

A new consti-
tution.

The constitution of the year III., as it is called, makes two decided modifications in the system of government which had prevailed since the king was deprived of power. One is a legislature of two houses, the other is a strong executive. Theoretically a legislature of one house might be considered better suited to a democratic state than one of two, as Benjamin Franklin regarded it in America. But experience had shown the French that they at least had need of the saucer, as Washington expressed it, in which to cool the hotter passions of the lower house, and if an upper house would do this they were ready to adopt it. The constitution expressed this idea by putting the minimum of age for membership in the upper house, or "Council of Ancients," at forty years. The lower house was to have 500 members, the upper 250.

A legislature of two houses.

The executive established by this constitution was the Directory, a board or council of five members elected by the two houses of the legislature, but not from their own number. Each director was to hold office for five years, but one, who could not be the outgoing director, was to be elected each year. The constitution made perhaps too complete a separation between their functions and those of the legislature. They were to have entire control of all executive and administrative matters, only the most important acts required any sanction from the legislature, and it could not impeach or depose the directors. On the other hand, they had no veto power and could exercise no legal influence upon legislation. A more serious defect was the division of power in the Directory itself between so many members. It was an improvement upon the exercise of the executive function by the legislature, but it was only an intermediate step on the way to a still stronger executive,

The Directory.

The Convention
unpopular.

The Convention had now accomplished its work, and the last part of it had been well done, but it had not made itself popular ; in Paris it was especially hated and in other parts of France there were signs of dislike. With the reaction against the Reign of Terror and the



COSTUME OF THE TIME OF THE REVOLUTION, IN
IMITATION OF THE GREEK.

growing caution, not to say conservatism, of France, the royalists had begun to dream of the possibility of a restoration of the monarchy. They especially hoped to win important successes in the elections which must soon be held for the legislature under the new constitution. The Convention was not blind to its unpopularity, and began to fear that its leaders might

suffer proscription from the new legislature unless they were protected in some way. To accomplish this, the Convention ordered that two thirds of the new body must be chosen from the old, thus giving them the con-

It attempts to
perpetuate
itself.

trol. The anger of the enemies of the Convention at this defeat of their hopes burst forth in an insurrection of the National Guard and mob of Paris and an armed attempt to force the Convention to withdraw their order—the insurrection of the 5th of October, 1795. This was the second step in the advancement of Bonaparte. Summoned to conduct the defense of the Convention, he swept the streets with his cannon, and simply mowed down the assailants without giving them an opportunity to fight. It was a clear indication of the merciless determination which would sweep away every obstacle to success at any expense.

Bonaparte disperses the mob.

Before the close of the month the Convention finally adjourned. In the three years of its life it had accomplished a really great and permanent work for France, of which the establishment of the republic was not the most important. It had devoted much time to the system of public education in France, and though it was not able to complete the work of organization, it took the first steps and established important permanent institutions. It founded the *École normale*, the *École polytechnique*, the *Conservatoire des arts et métiers*, and the Institute of France, and the national library based on the library of the king. In another direction it carried further the work of destroying the old feudal differences between the various parts of the country, by beginning the formation of a national law code for all France—the work which was completed in the *Code Napoléon*—and in the adoption of a uniform system of weights and measures—the metric system.

Work of the Convention for education.

A national law code.

The new government organized itself immediately on the dissolution of the Convention at the end of October, 1795. The directors would have been glad to bring the foreign war entirely to an end, but England and Austria

The government of the Directory.

—unfortunately for Austria—were still unwilling to grant satisfactory terms. The ablest of the directors was Carnot, the grandfather of the late president of the present French Republic, a man of decided military tastes, and to him was given entire control of the war policy of the



The "Organizer
of Victory."

LAZARE CARNOT.
Born 1753. Died 1823.

new government, with the understanding that the enemies of France should be vigorously attacked. The successes which followed secured for Carnot the title of "the Organizer of Victory," by which he is often referred to.

The main subject of interest in the war during 1796 is the great campaign of Bonaparte in Italy. Its details we cannot follow here. The plan for the year was to make the chief

attack upon the Austrians in Italy, while two armies advanced from the Rhine to threaten Vienna and occupy the forces of the small German states and a part of the Austrian armies. Bonaparte had less than forty thousand men with which to do his part of the work, but the spirit which he infused into men and officers, even into the general officers, who had received his appointment with jealousy, was worth another forty thousand. The little kingdom of Sardinia was a bitter enemy of the republic, because of the territory which it had lost, and its army was acting with the Austrians.

From the beginning, Bonaparte acted upon two of the leading principles of his military method, to move rapidly and to attack the enemy in detail before they

Bonaparte in
Italy.

Rapidity of his
successes.

could effect a union of their forces. He pushed his army between the Austrian and Sardinian forces, and, before the Austrian general was aware of his plan, he had defeated the Sardinians in five battles in ten days, and forced the king to sign an armistice. Bonaparte sent Marat to Paris with the news and twenty-one captured standards. But he did not pause. In another week he had turned the position of the Austrians on the Po and was behind them. Two days later he stormed the bridge at Lodi and forced the passage of the Adda. The Austrians fell back to the Alps, and Bonaparte entered Milan, the capital of their Italian possessions. For the moment, nothing in Italy could resist the French, and Bonaparte exacted heavy contributions from the little states and plundered their art galleries and libraries. The pope, who was by no means friendly to the republic, underwent the same fate and was mulcted 20,000,000 francs and hundreds of pictures and manuscripts.

Italy plundered.

But Austria was not to be driven from Italy by a six weeks' campaign. A new army nearly twice the size of the French, with one of her best generals, Wurmser, in command, was sent to recover possession. Bonaparte was besieging Mantua, the strongest fortress of Italy, when the Austrians came down in two divisions. By massing his troops first against one and then against the other division, he defeated them both, the second in the great battle of Castiglione. Once more Wurmser came on with a new army and was again beaten and finally shut up and besieged in Mantua.

New Austrian
armies

Then the Austrian government seemed to become conscious of the meaning of these successive defeats and of the destruction of its armies. The emperor, Francis II., invoked the national patriotism, and nobles and people responded. Another army, twice the size of

always de-
feated.

Bonaparte's, who had received no reënforcements, entered Italy. Bonaparte had to proceed with caution, but at last he turned the Austrian flank and won the great victory of Arcola. Again reënforcements raised the Austrian army to its original numbers, but it advanced in two divisions, and Bonaparte, planting himself at the point where they must come together, defeated them in succession. The next day but one, with a part of the same army, after a long, forced march, he routed a force which was attempting the relief of Mantua. These battles were in the middle of January, 1797, and on the 2d of February Mantua surrendered. It seemed evident now that the power of Austria in Italy was broken and the territories occupied were organized into republics in alliance with the French Republic. The pope was subjected to a new contribution and forced into a treaty with the French, and Bonaparte began to prepare for an advance upon Vienna from the south.

Italy made republican and an ally of France.

The French army began the attack about the middle of March, 1797. By the middle of April it had defeated the Austrians twice in their own territory and advanced to within less than a hundred miles of Vienna. By the 17th of April the emperor, who had also been severely beaten by the French on the Rhine, was willing to treat for peace. The preliminary convention of Leoben was signed on that day. Negotiations for the definitive peace dragged on through the summer, and Bonaparte occupied the interval in the further organization of Italy. Genoa was made over into the Ligurian Republic. The constitution of the Cisalpine Republic was completed. Venice was seized and forced to cede the Ionian Islands to France—a first indication of Bonaparte's naval plans. On the 17th of October the treaty

Austria ready for peace.

of Campo-Formio was signed. It was the most glorious peace that had ever yet been made by France, and seemed a realization of the hopes of French statesmen, cherished through four centuries. By this treaty Austria recognized the frontier of the Rhine for France, already recognized two years before by Prussia. This carried with it the cession of Belgium to the republic. The disposition which had been made of Italy was also accepted by Austria, and in return Venice was ceded to her, the end of the fourteen centuries of independence of that republic and the beginning of the Austrian domination in which the present century has been so interested.

The treaty of
Campo-Formio.

Venice becomes
Austrian.

Early in December Bonaparte returned to Paris. He found that some changes had taken place in his absence, indeed, he had himself assisted in them. In May elections had been held to renew one third of both houses of the legislature, as provided for in the constitution. These elections had gone against the members of the old Convention and resulted in the return of a considerable number of members who were in favor of a restoration of a monarchy of some sort. This party found itself strong enough to elect the new director, and the directors who held over began to be seriously alarmed at the possible results of the reaction. By the end of the summer three of them had resolved upon a *coup d'état* by military force to save the republic and themselves. Bonaparte was entirely opposed to the reaction and approved of the use of the army to prevent its success. On the 4th of September more than fifty of the members of the legislature of the new party were suddenly arrested and shipped to the penal colonies without trial. Their director and Carnot, who was opposed to the use of force, were allowed to escape. The people at large approved of

A reaction in
France in favor
of the monarchy

prevented by
force.

this revolution, and the republic seemed to be once more firmly established.

Plans against
England.

Bonaparte was now the greatest of the French generals, without any rival, and the directors were ready to give him charge of the most difficult task which they had yet undertaken, the conquest of England. He saw at once that their plan of a direct invasion of England could only result in failure while her mastery of the sea



ARCH OF TRIUMPH, PARIS.

Commemorating the victories of the revolutionary wars.

Bonaparte understands the
true policy for
France.

was still so undisputed, for the hopes of the directors of restoring the naval strength of France by an alliance with Spain or by the use of the Dutch fleet had both been defeated. But Bonaparte also saw that a most dangerous attack could be made upon England in another quarter, and he obtained leave to carry out the first of his great schemes against the century-long rival of France for colonial supremacy—schemes which, in one form or an-

other, were never long absent from his mind, as if he saw clearly, more clearly than any Frenchman before him had ever done, the true road to permanent future success.

On the 9th of May, 1798, he set sail for Egypt with an army of his old Italian soldiers. On the way he took possession of the island of Malta—an important link in the chain of communication. He landed on the 1st of July, and within the month he had captured Alexandria, gained the victory of the Pyramids, and taken Cairo. Everything had seemed to succeed, but he had been in Cairo only a week when his hopes were suddenly destroyed. Admiral Nelson had lost track of the French fleet on their way to Egypt, but he now found them drawn up to receive him near the mouth of the Nile. With most audacious disregard of the tactics he was expected to employ, he forced a part of his ships through the French line, and only two of their vessels escaped. Bonaparte was now cut off from France. The reinforcements which he had expected he could not receive. The help which he had expected to give to Tippoo Sahib in India, on which he had based his plan for the destruction of the English power there, he could not now give. At least, if his plan was not to be a failure, he must rely upon himself. And he does. He reforms the government of Egypt with the greatest skill, and when the Turks send an army to drive him out he goes to meet it in Syria and defeats it. But he is not strong enough to hold that country in addition to Egypt, and he is obliged to retreat. In Egypt he learns of the changes which have taken place in Europe and in France and he sees that he must return. He reached France early in October, 1799, after a more marvelous escape from the English cruisers than on his departure.

His expedition
to Egypt.

The battle of
the Nile.

Bonaparte re-
turns to France.

France in great
need of Bona-
parte.

Far more important events had taken place in Europe in his absence than any in which he had had a share in the East. For him his absence was fortunate, for he returned unconnected with any of the parties in the state, and sought after by all. Two series of changes must be noticed. In foreign affairs he found the coalition against France reëstablished, and the republic at war again with nearly all Europe. There was no dissenting voice to the opinion that the state had need of the highest military genius which it could command to make head against its enemies. In internal affairs, he found the Directory weak and unpopular, and government almost dissolved. Again the strong man of resources and of will, and of sufficient popularity to command general support, was demanded. The situation called for a man like Bona-parte, and there was no other man to meet the demand.

Europe
alarmed at the
arbitrary con-
duct of the
Directory.

It was, in the main at least, the fault of the Directory that a general war had broken out again so soon after the peace with Austria. The rulers of the republic apparently could not resist the temptation to extend their sort of liberty wherever any opportunity offered or could be created, and they could not refrain from treating Italy as conquered territory. The pope was driven from Rome, and the Roman Republic set up. The king of the Two Sicilies attempted to interfere in behalf of the pope and he was expelled from his continental lands, and the Parthenopean Republic was organized. Piedmont was seized from the king of Sardinia. The grand-duke of Tuscany was deprived of his little state without even waiting for a pretext. In Switzerland, a democratic party was supported by French forces, the old republic was revolutionized after the French style, and the example set in Italy was followed by sending the contents of the national treasury home to Paris.

Europe had good reason for feeling again that the lack of opportunity to stir up a revolution was the only thing that saved any state from France. England found it not difficult, especially in Austria, to get her arguments heard. At the same time, the new emperor of Russia, Paul, began to be afraid that France was getting too strong for Russian interests, especially when Bonaparte began to carry out what appeared to be very extensive plans of conquest in the East. The war began early in 1799, and if the French were not everywhere defeated, it was a year of hard fighting, in which, contrary to their recent experience, they made no advances. Italy, indeed, was entirely lost, and the new republics overthrown. The allies were commanded in that country by a Russian general of great ability, Suvarov, who defeated every French general sent against him, and by the end of summer was able to take his army into Switzerland to join the allies there. But in Switzerland, on the Rhine, and in Holland the French held their own. It seemed, however, to the people of France, after the victories of Bonaparte, a year of disasters, and though Russia retired from the coalition at the close of the campaign, there was great dissatisfaction with the conduct of military affairs. A general with such a record of an unbroken series of the most brilliant victories found the way easy to supreme command.

In home affairs the Directory had set an example of the violation of the constitution which might be turned against themselves. The elections in 1798 had resulted in the return of a considerable number of members of the democratic party, and the directors in office were as greatly opposed to this party, and feared it as much, as the royalist party of the year before. By an arbitrary assumption of power, without any legal justification, the

Again makes
war upon
France.

The popular
demand for
Bonaparte.

Arbitrary
action of the
directors in
France.

Rise of Siéyès.

directors declared a number of the seats vacant and filled them with their own adherents. Such things passed in the revolutionary atmosphere of France without any great opposition, but they left the government of the Directory little ground to complain when the tables were turned against itself. The disasters in the campaigns of 1798, however, weakened the directors more than this measure had strengthened them, and the elections of the spring of 1799 had not gone in their favor. The new director, who was then elected, was Siéyès, who had remained through all the changes of the Revolution a man of influence, and who had lately become convinced that a still stronger government than any yet formed was needed to meet the dangers that threatened France. The Directory itself was revolutionized in favor of these

ideas, and friends of Siéyès took the places of three of the former members. This was the situation which Bonaparte found on his return from Egypt.

Another revolution.



MEDALLION OF THE THREE CONSULS.

For about three weeks Bonaparte studied the ground, and then the Revolution proceeded rapidly. A part of the membership of the legislative councils and of the Directory were in favor of it. The councils were first removed to St. Cloud to be under easy control of the army. The lower house was cleared by the troops to get rid of those opposed to the changes, and the legislators left abolished the Directory, appointed Bonaparte, Siéyès, and Ducos a

provisional government with the title of Consuls, and joined commissioners with them to revise the constitution. The new constitution was very quickly constructed, and was accepted by the people in a general election on the 14th of December, 1799. It was a frank step backward toward a strong executive, for though the executive responsibility was laid upon three consuls, the real power was in the hands of the First Consul, who was Bonaparte. The steps were now easy, and hardly any longer revolutionary, to the Empire, and the reëstablishment of an absolute government.

Bonaparte,
First Consul.

CHAPTER XVII.*

NAPOLEON.

Bonaparte sole
ruler of France.

THE revolution which established the Consulate in the place of the Directory vested the power really in Bonaparte alone, and, from this date, he was the sole and irresponsible ruler of France until he left the country a prisoner in the hands of his enemies. The power which



NAPOLEON.

he now acquired he used with great moderation and wisdom. Political proscriptions ceased. Exiles were allowed to return. La Vendée was pacified. Order was restored throughout the country. Better organization was given to the administration and the finances were reformed. The necessary constitutional changes in the interest of greater central-

The government centralized.

ization were easily made and received the approval of all. And the work of forming a uniform law code for

* As the history of France during the nineteenth century has been presented in a very full and very interesting way in Professor Judson's "Europe in the Nineteenth Century" in this series, only the larger features of that history will be given here. The reader who may wish a more detailed account is referred to that book.

all France, which had been begun some time before, was resumed and continued, under the supervision of Bonaparte, until the various codes, to which the name of Napoleon has been given, were completed.

The military situation demanded the immediate attention of Bonaparte, and the campaign of the year 1800 which followed was a new series of French successes like those of the first Italian campaign. Bonaparte forced his way through the Alps, won the hard-fought battle of Marengo, and quickly recovered possession of all northern Italy. Another French army slowly pushed the Austrians down the Danube Valley, and by the close of the year Vienna was threatened by two French armies from the west and the south. Austria was forced to a separate peace with France, in which she recognized the Rhine as the eastern frontier of France, and abandoned her possessions in northern Italy except Venice.

The campaign
of 1800.

Peace with
Austria.

England was now left the only enemy of France in the field. But she was an enemy peculiarly hard to reach. The armed neutrality of the northern powers, which had been counted on to dispute her commercial and naval supremacy, and to compensate to some extent for the weakness of the French navy, really accomplished nothing. It led, a few weeks after the withdrawal of Austria from the war, to the bombardment of Copenhagen by Nelson, and was soon dissolved. England forced the French to withdraw from Egypt; Bonaparte gained some successes from Portugal in his warfare upon English commerce. But neither enemy could seriously injure the other, and finally the treaty of Amiens was concluded between them. This was in form a treaty of peace, but both parties understood perfectly well that no permanent peace was as yet possible between them, and both regarded it as a mere truce in which to prepare for a new war.

England alone
maintains the
war.

Peace of
Amiens, 1802.

The organization of France.

But for a time all Europe was at peace. The interval was used by Bonaparte to complete the new administrative organization of France. This was carried through with great skill, and it is upon this work that Napoleon's claim to the fame of a statesman as well as a general must rest. The codification of the laws was also pushed to completion during this time. The French Catholic Church, too, was reëstablished, and an agreement made with the pope for a division of the control over the clergy between the church and the state.

Bonaparte resumes his colonial plans.

This interval of peace allowed Bonaparte to take up, also, a plan which we have seen him attempting before, and which undoubtedly he was resolved to accomplish at the first opportunity—the restoration of the colonial power of France that she might be able to carry on the inevitable struggle with England upon more equal terms. This time his plans looked to the West rather than to the East and their success would have threatened the future interests of the United States as seriously as those of England.

The San Domingo expedition.

During the last war, Spain had been induced to give up to France the great territory of Louisiana, west of the Mississippi, which France had ceded to her in 1763. And now, with the West India island of San Domingo as a basis, Bonaparte was about to reëstablish the French power in North America. Three weeks after the preliminaries of the peace of Amiens had been signed, and before the definitive treaty had yet been arranged, Bonaparte gave orders to his brother-in-law, Leclerc, to set sail for San Domingo with a large fleet and army which had been for some time collecting in the western harbors of France. The expedition was a military success, but it could not resist the yellow fever, and before the plan could be carried further war was on

the point of beginning again in Europe. Knowing that with the naval force then at his command he could not hope to retain Louisiana, Bonaparte resolved to keep it out of the hands of England at any cost, and readily consented to sell it to the United States.

Louisiana sold to the United States.

The truce lasted a little more than a year. The war began in the spring of 1803, and England never again made a truce with Napoleon. His plan at the opening of the war was a great invasion of England for which he made extensive preparations, but Austria and Russia soon joined England, and he had need of all his strength on the Continent. Here

Plans for the invasion of England.



COIN OF THE YEAR XII., 1803-4.

his military success was still unbroken. An Austrian army was forced to surrender at Ulm ; Vienna was occupied ; a combined Austrian and Russian army was overthrown in the great battle of Austerlitz ; and at last Austria was compelled to make another separate peace. Prussia now, too late to be of any real service, joined the alliance, and venturing to fight without help was beaten at the battle of Jena, and Napoleon entered Berlin. From there he pushed on against the Russians, defeated them in some battles, took possession of Warsaw, and finally at the peace of Tilsit turned Russia from an enemy into an ally.

Victories over Austria,

and Prussia.

Peace of Tilsit, July 8, 1807.

Napoleon was now at the highest point of his power. The Continent was forced to submit to his dictation. Early in the war he had assumed the titles of Emperor of the French and King of Italy, and now the whole map of Europe was in his hands to tear to pieces and

Napoleon's highest point of success.

His reorganization of Europe.

make over as he pleased, and he proceeded to do it. His enemies were punished and his friends rewarded on a large scale. Austria and Prussia were deprived of much territory. Dozens of little German states disappeared. Bavaria, Württemberg, and Saxony were made kingdoms. One of his brothers became king of Naples, and another king of Holland. The Confederation of the Rhine was formed of the west German states, almost as much under Napoleon's control as if it had been annexed to France. And to make everything complete, Francis Joseph laid aside the title of Emperor of Rome, which had come down in succession from Charlemagne, so that there was not even a mere matter of form to prevent Napoleon from regarding himself, as he did, as the true successor of Charlemagne and the great Roman emperors. Only England still resisted.

He regards his empire as a revival of the Roman.

The continental blockade, 1806.

It was the highest point of Napoleon's real power. And apparently the unlimited character of this power, the not unnatural belief that he could do anything he desired to do, led him into two mistakes of policy which mark the turn in his fortunes. The first of these was his attempt to exclude England from commercial connection with the whole of Europe, which is known as his "Continental System." It was an entire failure. It worked commercially rather to the advantage of England than otherwise, and it excited much discontent and hostility, and opened the eyes of men to their true interests.

Napoleon attempts to make Spain a vassal state, and rouses a national resistance.

The other mistake was his interference in Spain which resulted in the abdication of the Bourbons and the attempt to make his brother Joseph king of that country. This was followed by the same kind of an insurrection of the Spanish people in defense of their independence as that which had been of such great assistance to

France at the beginning of the Bourbon dynasty in Spain. For the first time the French had to fight a nation in arms instead of armies. At the same time came a change of English policy by which she determined to fight Napoleon in a way that would really reach him, with armies on the Continent. From this dates the beginning of the famous peninsula campaign which made the fame of Wellington and proved no small factor in the final discomfort of Napoleon.

Early in 1809 Austria, which had been carefully reorganizing its army, resolved to take advantage of the diversion in Spain and to try once more to check the progress of Napoleon's power. But the old result fol-

lowed. Napoleon rapidly pushed back the Austrian armies, entered Vienna, won the great victory of Wagram, forced Austria to a new humiliating treaty, and followed the war with another series of annexations of territory to France, which carried the empire of Napoleon to the



WELLINGTON.

Arthur Wellesley, duke of Wellington. Born in Ireland 1769. Entered the army as ensign 1787. Served in India 1797-1805. Chief secretary for Ireland 1807. Commander-in-chief in Portugal and Spain 1809. Waterloo 1815. Prime minister 1828. Died 1852.

A change of English policy.

Austria tries war again.

France at its widest extent territorially.

Napoleon
marries Maria
Louisa, April
1, 1810.

The national
spirit aroused
in Germany.

Russia strikes
first.

Napoleon's
retreat is
followed by the
insurrection of
Europe.

The battle of
Leipzig,
October 16-19,
1813.

Baltic and the Adriatic. The war was followed also by a still further humiliation of the House of Hapsburg, which was asked to give one of its daughters, Maria Louisa, to take the place of the divorced Josephine.

For a little more than two years after this war with Austria, Napoleon was at war with only one state, England. But the exhausting peninsula campaign went on without a pause, and, still more ominous for the future, there was a great awakening of a national spirit in Germany, and Prussia was reorganizing her government and carrying through a series of the most important reforms. Napoleon's power seemed to be as great as ever, but the people, the most dangerous of all enemies, were now arousing themselves against him, and the terrible losses of his earlier wars had destroyed the splendid armies with which he had won his first victories, and they could not be replaced with any material at his command.

Russia struck the blow which proved to be the first in the actual downfall of Napoleon. This was not a declaration of war but an alliance with England, which to Napoleon's mind was the same thing. He resolved to treat Russia now as he had all the rest of Europe, and in May, 1812, his invasion began. Then followed rapidly the familiar events: the defeat of the Russians in the field, the occupation of Moscow, the great fire, and the retreat through the fearful Russian winter with the Cossacks hanging on the skirts of the army at every step. Then came the general insurrection of Europe, first Prussia and then Austria. Even many of the vassal states which he had heaped with favors turned against Napoleon at this moment of his greatest need. The terrible three days' battle of Leipzig, the "battle of the nations," almost annihilated his army and drove him back to the other side of the Rhine.

The allies now invaded France from every side, and though there was every evidence that the military genius of Napoleon was still equal to the task imposed upon it, the resources of France were exhausted and his armies were too small and of too poor material to resist the forces of combined Europe. On the last day of March the allies entered Paris, and within a week Napoleon abdicated. He was allowed to retain the title of emperor, and to be the sovereign of the little island of Elba on

The allies
invade France.



LOUIS XVIII.

the west coast of Italy. Louis XVIII., the brother of Louis XVI., became king of France, and promised to grant his subjects a constitutional government.

Louis XVIII.
restored.

The military struggle against Napoleon was followed by the diplomatic struggle of the allies among themselves over the problems which the necessity of making a new map of Europe presented. Diplomacy is not a rapid business, and the ambassadors of the powers were still in the midst of it, a year later, when Napoleon suddenly reappeared in France, and set them some new problems. The year of restored Bourbon rule had done much to create a new enthusiasm for Napoleon, and he had behind him in this brief struggle the "Hundred Days,"

The Congress of
Vienna.

Napoleon's
return from
Elba.

Waterloo, June
18, 1815.

a national spirit of resistance which had been lacking in the general indifference of the year before. But resistance was hopeless from the start, and if the great battle of Waterloo had been as complete a victory for Napoleon as it was for the allies, the final outcome could not have been different, though it might have been delayed in time and have cost more in treasure and in lives. The conquerors took pains to secure themselves and Europe from the danger of another general war by sending Napoleon to St. Helena and by imposing harder terms upon France than they had at first intended.

The results of
the Revolution
not destroyed.

Revolutionary France was at last subdued, and the sovereigns and diplomats of Europe could parcel out the whole continent as suited themselves, with no regard to the wishes of the people concerned, but the real results sought by the Revolution were not destroyed, and they are now enjoyed more or less completely by nearly all nations. In a single word these may be said to be comprised in the forcible opening of the Continent to the principles and methods of popular sovereignty as these had been established by the Anglo-Saxon race. Experimenting to invent another king of liberty had not proved profitable, and Europe, in the end, settled down to a more or less open imitation of the institutions which the long experience of the English had found to be the best. The reaction against the Revolution was temporary and on the surface. New movements to secure the same results were not long delayed, and, as experience and bitter knowledge were acquired, they became more hopeful. Much that had been gained survived, indeed, the complete overthrow of the Revolution. The feudal system and serfdom had disappeared from large portions of Europe where they reigned supreme in 1789. Dozens of little states with their

Summary of
results.

contemptibly petty courts and sovereigns had been swept away. Prussia had taken a long step forward as a great German power. The spirit of nationality, though not strong enough as yet to compel recognition in a diplomatic congress, had arisen among the people and was destined soon to grow into one of the strongest forces of the century. Germany and Italy had paid a great price, and they were treated by the Congress of Vienna in the most arbitrary and violent manner, but their gain was enormous, and both these nations, as they now exist, rest upon the ground swept clear of old conditions by the Napoleonic wars.

On the whole,
an age of gain.

CHAPTER XVIII.

FRANCE SINCE 1815.

The peculiarity
of French
history since
1815.

See C. K. Adams's "Democracy and Monarchy in France," and G. L. Dickinson's "Revolution and Reaction in Modern France."

No apparent
growth in self-
government
before 1875.

THE inner political history of France since 1815 is a very peculiar, almost incredible, history, and yet it is not unnatural if we regard it in the light of the past life of the nation. It is a history of changes, and even of revolutions, in which the great mass of the people has had no interest, and of governments almost no one of which has been cordially supported by more than a small minority of the nation, and which were often able to maintain themselves in power only because their opponents could not agree upon any common policy. It is a history in which we find again and again the same vague and inflated phrases, the same childlike trust in written formulas, and the same inability to resist a sudden *coup d'état*, whether of a prince-president or of a communistic street orator. We can trace through it all no growth in the understanding of practical liberty and how to defend it, or in self-control or self-government, until we come to the history of the Third Republic. All this should be interpreted, as we have seen in the case of the great Revolution, in the light of the past history of France. A nation which had never been allowed, since it was a nation, to govern itself, could not learn that most difficult of all arts in ten years, and that was all the time it had had for learning before 1815. Undoubtedly during those years in which we can trace no progress, between 1815 and 1875, it was slowly learning, and the great promise which the present government gives of

self-control and stability has in all probability a solid basis in acquired training, but the training was going on silently. It does not show itself in the constitutions or in the political changes.

The history of the first of these governments, that of the monarchy of the Restoration, is the history of a slowly growing reaction against liberal ideas on the part of the government which finally culminated in another revolution. The king, Louis XVIII., was a Bourbon,

The first government of the period.



MEDAL TO COMMEMORATE THE CHARTER OF 1814.

who dated his reign from the execution of the little dauphin, but he was not exactly a Bourbon of the old type. He was willing to recognize the fact that the Revolution had destroyed much of the old *régime* which could never be restored, and to try to rule in harmony with the spirit of a new France. To be sure he proceeded on the old theory that the sovereign is the source of all legitimate authority, and the Charter, as the new constitution was called, was not the creation of the people but was a free gift of his royal goodness, yet still it was a constitution, and a constitutional monarchy was possible under it. It established a legislature of two houses, the upper a house of peers, the lower elected by a restricted suffrage, based upon a property qualification. The con-

Louis XVIII. was a liberal Bourbon.

The constitution.

duct of the government was placed in the hands of a ministry responsible to the legislature, which had the right of making all laws and of voting all taxes. It was a copy of the English constitution, and the king seems to have honestly intended to give it a fair trial. He would not grant the demands of the returned *émigrés* or of the old church, and he made no disguise of his intention to reign as a moderate, if not as a liberal sovereign.

But he could not change the ideas of his party. His legislature proved more reactionary than himself, and their ideas obtained a gradually increasing influence on the policy of the government. This was especially the case after the assassination of the duke of Berry, who stood second in the direct line of succession to the throne. From that date occasional reactionary measures were adopted or allowed, like the return of the Jesuits or the stopping of the lectures of Guizot. The most open of these acts was the invasion of Spain by a French army, with the support of the Holy Alliance, in the interest of the Spanish Bourbons.* Under the protection of this army, Ferdinand VII. arbitrarily abolished the Spanish constitution and restored the absolute monarchy. In France itself, however, the reaction did not go far enough in this reign to bring about any serious changes in the constitution or to interfere with the natural development of the country, and the period is characterized by a very rapid increase of wealth and recovery from the losses and exhaustion of the Napoleonic wars.

In the year after the Spanish expedition, Louis XVIII. died and was succeeded by his brother, the irreconcil-

The assassina-
tion of the duke
of Berry,
February 13,
1820.

French
invasion of
Spain, April,
1823.

Prosperity of
France.

*This incident is of especial interest to Americans because it gave rise, at the suggestion of England, to the official declaration of our policy which has since been known by the name of the Monroe Doctrine.

able count of Artois of the Revolution, who took the name of Charles X. He was a thorough believer in the divine right of kings—he even thought he could cure the king's evil by a touch of his royal hand—and the reaction proceeded rapidly. He demanded and obtained a thousand million francs to compensate the nobles for the lands which the republic had confiscated, and in 1827 the National Guard was disbanded. In this same year, however, the Liberal party, which had been aided not a little in its rapid growth by these measures, obtained a majority in the Chambers. But two years later the king suddenly dismissed his ministry and appointed a new one after his own mind, but without the sanction of the Chamber of Deputies. Their vote of want of confidence was answered by a dissolution, but the election returned them to the House. Then the king determined to try the effect of a revolution in favor of absolutism, and issued the edicts of July 26, 1830, which virtually destroyed the constitution. Paris rose in insurrection, and in three days the king was forced to abdicate and was driven into exile, and in ten days more Louis Philippe was king in his place.

Charles X.,
1824-1830.

A reactionary
king.

He attempts a
coup d'état.

Louis Philippe was a Bourbon, but it was two hundred years back to his first ancestor who had worn a crown, and he was a Bourbon of a different type from those in the direct line. The son of that duke of Orleans who had been called *Égalité* in the early days of the Revolution, he posed as a prince of democratic beliefs and popular tastes. He was the "citizen king" and the theory of the monarchy was no longer that of divine right, but the king recognized as frankly the parliamentary character of his title as ever the House of Hanover has done in England.

Louis Philippe,
1830-1848.

A constitu-
tional king.

The constitution of the new monarchy was only the

The constitution.

charter of 1814 modified, but the modifications were important, especially in the fact that these changes were made by the legislature and accepted by the king, who thus abandoned the old monarchical principle and recognized the right of the people to create the constitution. The House of Peers was deprived of its hereditary character, the term for which the lower house was elected was reduced, the property qualification for the



AN OFFICER OF GUIDES OF THE IMPERIAL
GUARD.

suffrage was lowered, and the clause of the Charter which seemed to confer on the king a right of legislation, upon which Charles X. had based his right to issue the edicts which had caused his fall, was stricken out. It was a step toward a more democratic government, but the step was not a

No absolutism intended.

long one. It was still a constitutional monarchy, but it was one with no disguised intention of absolutism, and it found its chief support in the great middle class of France.

But a king of such a sort as Louis Philippe proved to

be could never permanently satisfy the French people. He was a mediocre man, and his reign of eighteen years is a very mediocre and *bourgeois* period in the history of France. Even the French successes in Algiers and the rapidly increasing prosperity of the country did not reconcile the nation to the second-rate part which the government was satisfied to play in foreign affairs, or to the thrifty efforts of the king to provide abundantly for his large family. The king was able to keep control of the Chambers, but the opposition was growing outside and adopted the English fashion of banquets as a means of agitation. One of these to be held in Paris on Washington's birthday, 1848, the ministry—Guizot was at its head—forbade and this was the signal for another sudden insurrection of Paris. It was successful as quickly as the one that had brought Louis Philippe into power, though it was solely a movement of the Paris mob with no support in France at large and succeeded chiefly because of a lack of firmness on the part of the king, yet in three days he was in flight for the frontier, disguised as Mr. Smith.

Louis Philippe was too slow-going for the French.

The Revolution of 1848.

The success of the revolution was as much a surprise to its leaders as to any one, and there was a moment of hesitation as to the course to be pursued, but the Paris mob invaded the Chambers and decided the question for the republic. The Second French Republic is, with the exception of the early stages of the Third Republic, the most peculiar of the French governments of this century. It was a republic established practically by accident and which the people of France did not desire, outside of a small minority. It was a republic supported by an Assembly in which the Monarchists had a large majority. It was kept in existence only by the fact that the three monarchical parties could not agree upon a

The mob establishes the Second Republic.

Not generally desired in France.

common policy, and when the main body of the people did come to an agreement it was set aside with only the slightest difficulty.

Socialistic
tendencies.

For a little time at the beginning the mob and the socialist party, which was just beginning to be an im-



LAZARE HIPPOLYTE CARNOT.
Born 1801. Died 1888. Minister of
education under the Second Re-
public.

portant factor in French politics, had control. The provisional government voted that the state should give employment to all the unemployed, and the easily imaginable results followed that the number of the unemployed rapidly increased, and that the efficiency of the labor as rapidly declined. But this was for a moment only, and though it cost several days of bloody fighting in the streets of Paris,

the middle classes and the moderate Republicans recovered control. Then a definite republican constitution was adopted.

The constitu-
tion.

The Constituent Assembly which adopted this constitution was in session more than a year, and during the first part of that time it conducted by itself the government of France. In its constitution it returned to the ideas of the early Revolution. It established universal suffrage and a legislature of one house only, elected for three years. It added to this a president, elected for four years, but in his relation to the legislature it followed the American rather than the English practice, and made him independent of the legislature and irremovable by it, giving him on the other hand no power to

dissolve that body and appeal to the people by a new election. In the condition of French parties at the time, this arrangement was sure to lead to irreconcilable differences between the two. As a matter of fact the president and the legislature were agreed in scarcely more than one thing, their hatred of the republic and their desire to overthrow it. Upon the government which should take its place there was no agreement possible, for the legislature was monarchical and the president was for himself, but the disagreements between them prepared the way for the *coup d'état*.

For the presidency there was only one

strong candidate, Louis Napoleon, and for him it was very fortunate that his past career had been such as to appear ridiculous in the eyes of most Frenchmen. He was not feared as he ought to have been, and he was elected by a large majority. With great skill he used

The president
and the
legislature.



A CUIRASSIER OFFICER, FRENCH CAVALRY,
DURING THE SECOND EMPIRE.

Napoleon
made
president.

See Victor Hugo's "History of a Crime."

The *coup d'état*.

Louis Napoleon's constitution.

It established a personal government.

the growing fear with which the middle classes looked upon the Red Republicans, and also the mistakes of policy of which the Assembly was guilty, especially in attempting to limit the right of suffrage, to advance his own personal cause as the representative of order and safe popular government, and there can be no doubt but that the great majorities with which his *coup d'état* of December, 1851, and the proclamation of the Empire a year later, were sanctioned really represented the feelings of a large majority of the French people, though very likely the actual majority had been artificially swelled.

For some weeks after the *coup d'état*, the government of France was really an absolute monarchy, the president assuming the right to issue laws of his own with no legislative sanction, but it did not differ in this regard from the various other provisional governments with which France had become familiar in revolutionary crises. The constitution which Louis Napoleon submitted to the vote of the people was one of his own construction. It reproduced forms of the imperial constitution of the first Napoleon, though it retained the name of the republic. It created Louis Napoleon president for ten years. The legislature was composed of three bodies, as in the constitution of the year VIII., with the same limitations on free legislative action. The Council of State framed all the laws and was itself nominated by the president; the Senate was also nominated; the *Corps Législatif* was elected by universal suffrage, but its legislative activity was confined to a veto upon the acts submitted to it by the Council of State. In form the constitution established the responsibility of the president, but as this would have the effect to make the ministry no longer responsible, and as it must be itself,

under the circumstances, only a fiction, all real responsibility was destroyed. To the president was given the ordinary prerogatives of a sovereign in regard to treaties, war and peace, the army, and the appointment of executive officers. The constitution was in fact so thoroughly monarchical, both in spirit and in form, that, when the Empire was established, it needed only the change of names and titles to adapt it to the new conditions. The essential clauses all remained unchanged.

The policy of the Second Empire was a thoroughly selfish one, but it was based on the principle that to secure the interests of France at home and abroad was the best

way to secure the permanency of the dynasty. Or, it would perhaps be more accurate to say that its leading object was to keep the people well satisfied with the policy of the government, both domestic and foreign. For years this policy was eminently successful. Within France internal improvements were carried out on an extensive scale. Cities were transformed. A new Paris was created. Railroad building was pushed rapidly forward with state aid. Canals and harbors shared the same favor. Agriculture, forestry, and drainage received government attention and money.



The policy of
Napoleon III.

NAPOLEON III.

Born 1808. President of France 1848. Emperor 1852. Dethroned 1870. Died 1873.

to keep
France in good
humor.

Summary of
results.

A commercial policy closely bordering on free trade was adopted and steamship lines were subsidized. There was also some colonial expansion, especially through the conquest of Cochin-China, though neither the emperor nor the French people were at this time greatly interested in gaining colonies. On the whole, in spite of some unfortunate years, France grew rich and prospered, and the people had an abundance of money with which to take up the government loans.

Two foreign wars.

In foreign affairs no great crisis arose until the rivalry with Prussia, which was destined to be the ruin of the Empire. But it was not a little to the satisfaction of the French that Russia was obliged to acknowledge herself beaten in the Crimean War largely by the arms of France, and it was still more to their satisfaction that their ancient enemy, Austria, was humbled by their armies almost alone, in the war for the liberation of Italy, and that the boundaries of France were once more carried forward on the east in the old fashion by the annexation of Savoy and Nice.

Growing opposition to Napoleon III.

The close of the Italian war marks probably the highest point of power to which Napoleon III. attained. From this time on the opposition party grew more and more troublesome, and the emperor was forced to make one concession after another, all in the direction of limitations upon his own power. The expedition to Mexico proved a great failure, and the rapid rise of Prussia under the direction of Bismarck was very disquieting. It was at this point that the emperor committed his greatest and fatal mistake of policy. A struggle between Prussia and France was inevitable, and should have been foreseen in France as it was in Prussia. Prussia could never accomplish the work which she had at heart—the work of unity and recon-

The rise of Prussia.

struction of the German nationality—so long as the reluctant south German states could count on any strong ally. The world may perhaps rejoice that France had at this time no Bismarck in her cabinet, but for the Napoleonic dynasty it was an irretrievable mistake not to have stepped at once to the side of Austria at the beginning of the "Seven Weeks' War." Possibly the result would not have been very different if this had been done, but to wait until her best ally was crushed and then to make war alone upon a greatly strengthened Prussia was to commit the same folly of which Prussia had been herself guilty in going to war with Napoleon after the battle of Austerlitz. The result was a great surprise to France, though it had been carefully prepared in advance by Prussia. The pouring of the German armies into France, the rapid blows and almost continuous successes, the sudden collapse of the power of Louis Napoleon after the battle of Sedan, all these are familiar facts.

The Franco-Prussian War.

The Third Republic began, as had now come to be, we may say, the regular fashion, with the terrorizing of the legislature by a Parisian mob, who demanded the republic and who set up by their own authority a provisional government. This government conducted the defense of Paris as bravely as was possible under the circumstances, and though a new Assembly was elected before peace was made with the Germans, no permanent government was created. Thiers was made a kind of executive head, and made the best terms possible with the enemy, and then conducted the desperate struggle with the Paris Commune, which injured the city more than the siege by the Germans. A few months later M. Thiers was given the title of President, but still no constitution was adopted, nor the final form of the govern-

The establishment of the Third Republic.

Government
without a
constitution.

ment settled upon. The country was too much occupied with other more pressing problems to spare time for this so long as things went fairly well : with the payment of



THIERS.

Louis Adolphe Thiers, born 1797. Lawyer and journalist. Author of "History of the French Revolution" and "The Consulate and Empire." Prime minister under Louis Philippe. President of the French Republic 1871-3. Died 1877.

The majority
Monarchists,
but divided.

which had a large majority in the Assembly, was as divided as then and could not be brought to support a common policy. Thiers was himself a Monarchist, but he had very strict ideas of his duty, and was not willing to be made use of to bring about any kind of a restoration. According to the arrangement which had been made when the presidency was established, his position was much like that of a member of his cabinet, for he retained his seat as a deputy in the Assembly, and took part in the debates, like an English prime minister, and

the indemnity in order to be rid of the German soldiers, the recovery from the losses of the war, the reorganization of the army in view of the lessons they had been taught.

By degrees, however, the question of the form of government became a leading one. The mass of the French people seemed to be no more devoted to a republic now than in the time of the Second Republic, but the party of the Monarchists,

he was in the same way bound to resign upon an adverse vote. Finally a combination of parties carried a vote of the Assembly against him, and he resigned. Immediately Marshal MacMahon, a Monarchist, was elected to succeed him, and a Monarchist ministry, that of the Duc de Broglie, came into office.

The chance of the restoration of a Bourbon kingdom in France seemed for a time very good. The count of Paris, the head of the Orleanist family, offered to relinquish his claim to the throne if the Comte de Chambord, the heir of the direct line, would accept the principles of the constitutional monarchy in good faith. This, however, he refused to do, and France was forced to fall back temporarily at least on the republic, and MacMahon was made president for seven years. Somewhat more than a year later, while no formal constitution was adopted, several constitutional laws were passed more definitely organizing the republic.

The constitutional history of the Third Republic is very interesting, and the contrast which it presents to all

The resignation of Thiers, May 24, 1873.

MacMahon president.



The Comte de Chambord stands by the Bourbon theory, October, 1873.

MARSHAL MACMAHON.
Second president. Born July 13, 1808.
Died October 17, 1893.

The peculiar form of the present French constitution.

See Saleilles's "Development of the Present Constitution of France," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. VI. A translation of the text of the laws by Currier is given in the same publication, supplement for March, 1893.

This contributes to its stability.

The constitution a creature of circumstances.

earlier French constitutional experiments probably contains the secret of the growing stability of the present government. It is of primary significance that no formal constitution has been adopted. Not to have an eloquent statement of the inalienable rights of the citizen, which should warn off intending despots and protect liberty, would have seemed near suicide to the early French Republicans, and not to have a definite constitution, specifying article by article all the powers and limitations of the government, created by the act of the sovereign people and subject to amendment only by their act, would have seemed to them impossible, but the present republic has certainly not suffered from these deficiencies. In one respect, at least, this incomplete and temporary character of the constitution has tended, if we may say so, to render it permanent. The absence of extreme and even of definite statements has kept it from exciting the animosity and fear of its opponents, while its apparently temporary character has held out the constant hope of change to all who have preferred another form of government. Another result of this absence of a formal constitution is that revolution is less necessary. Changes can be more easily made, and they seem less vital and irretrievable, and growing opinion modifies the form of the government more quickly and with less agitation.

What may be called the present French constitution consists of a series of constitutional and "organic" laws, adopted by the Assembly elected in 1871, and subject to amendment by the ordinary legislature at any time, the two Houses acting in a joint session as a National Assembly. This peculiar character of the constitution was not the result of deliberate intention, but of the special circumstances of the case. The most impor-

tant of these was the fact that the constitution was the work of those who were really opposed to a republic and who were willing to adopt only temporary expedients and such as seemed absolutely necessary at the moment, in the hope that the time would soon come when a monarchical government of some kind could be established. In this way the opponents of the republic, who were in possession of the majority in the Assembly, were of greater service to the republic than its friends could have been. France drifted into its present strong government, or, better, it is, like the English government, the result of a natural and unconscious growth, and this is one important element of its strength. In one respect the constitution making was like the American from the fact that compromise determined many features where extreme measures were not possible.

The National Assembly met February 13, 1871, and at once assumed control of France in place of the provisional government. A little more than two thirds of its members were Monarchists, but divided, as so many times before, into three parties, Orleanists, Legitimists,

Made by its
enemies.



In compromises
somewhat like
the American.

M. Grévy.

Third president. Born August 15, 1807 (?).
Died September 9, 1891.

The earlier
constitutional
action of the
Assembly of
1871.

and Imperialists. The executive which it established was purely a cabinet system with Thiers at its head, soon to be called president, but in reality only a prime minister subject to removal by a vote of want of confidence, as has been said. In March, 1873, the first law was passed defining the functions of the executive side of the government, but this is of little importance, except as serving to facilitate the downfall of Thiers, who was tending toward a belief in the permanent expediency of a republican government too rapidly to suit the majority.

Under
MacMahon
constitution
making begins.



SADI CARNOT.
Fourth president. Grandson of the
"Organizer of Victory" and son of
Minister Carnot (see page 324). Born
August 11, 1837. Assassinated June 24,
1894.

From the beginning of MacMahon's presidency, constitutional discussion occupied much of the time of the Assembly, but for two years no actual progress was made, except in the law making the president's term seven years. Within this period, the Monarchists believed, the way could be prepared for a restoration of some kind, and therefore all that needed to be provided for was a republican government that would run seven years. It was largely in this spirit that the constitutional laws of 1875 were adopted.

The "constitu-
tional laws" of
1875.

The earliest of these were in February of that year, the first on the 24th, establishing a Senate, but postponed by its terms to the one adopted on the next day, which was chiefly concerned with the office of president.

Both these were to a certain extent compromises, going farther than the Monarchists would have gone if left to themselves, or if they had thought it prudent to put off longer any constitutional action, but by no means doing all that the Republicans demanded. The effect of these acts was, however, to give the republic a firmer footing and a greater air of permanence. On July 16, of the same year, a further constitutional law was adopted, defining the relations of the departments of the government to one another. This is the longest and the most complete in its constitutional character of the three laws. To these were added, during the year, "organic laws," dealing mainly with elections. These differ from the constitutional laws only in the fact that they are subject to change by the two Houses acting separately, exactly as ordinary laws.

Compromises
which
strengthened
the republic.

During the five years of the life of the National Assembly which adopted this constitution, there had been a steady increase of Republican sentiment in France, and the elections to the new legislature, held in February, 1876, returned a Republican majority to both Houses, though it was a majority of conservative, not of extreme Republicans. This sentiment has been steadily increasing in the nation since that time, as the government has been found to be stable and to furnish full security. It has expressed itself very conservatively, however, in the revision of the constitution, but few amendments having been adopted and none changing the character of the constitution, with the single exception of an amendment, adopted in 1884, declaring that the republican form of government cannot be made the subject of revision.

A Republican
majority in the
new legislature.

Growth of
Republican
sentiment since
that date.

The constitution thus given to France is based confessedly on the English constitution, and it follows its

The present French constitution closely follows the English,

even in cabinet responsibility.

general features rather closely. It is, however, in one respect a unique experiment. This is in the fact that France is the only great and fully sovereign republic in which trial is making of the borrowed English system of the responsibility of the cabinet to the legislature, with



JULES FERRY.

Twice prime minister of France. Born April 5, 1832. Died March 16, 1893.

This is an experiment of interest to us.

the correlative power to dissolve the legislature and appeal to the people on any particular question. The great English colonies which have this system are of course republics, but they have not full sovereignty, and this difference is important, because their cabinets are relieved of all responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, in which, in any sovereign state, and especially in one situated as

France is, great strain is likely to be felt

at times. England itself is so nearly a republic that there is no practical difference—indeed a French political writer declared some time ago that England is more of a republic than the United States—but it is removed from the comparison with others in this respect to this point by the fact that this form of government has been reached in that country by a very long and slow develop-

ment, and this, with the entire absence of revolutions during the process, gives a degree of confidence and security to the future outlook which countries where the system is a new experiment cannot have. So that the experience of France will be of much greater value to others—to ourselves, for example, if the question of our adopting a similar system should ever arise in the future—than that of England, or of the great English colonies.

One slight peculiarity in the French system should be noticed, as the beginning of a possible development of which the English system, so far as it has yet extended in the Anglo-Saxon world, does not admit. In the voluntary resignation of President MacMahon, and in the forced resignation of President Grévy, precedents have been established which would seem to mean the development of a responsibility of the president to the legislature similar to that of the cabinet, but taking effect only in more important cases. This has, however, not gone far enough as yet to be considered anything more than an interesting possibility.

One possible development not known in the Anglo-Saxon world.

The government of the Third Republic, since the Republican party came into control of it, has twice been subjected to tests which would not be severe in an Anglo-Saxon state, but which, judged from the history of France in this century, must be considered of the greatest severity for any French government. The comparative calmness, moderation, and sound good sense with which the Republican leaders have met the crisis in both cases give rise to the happiest conclusions as to the progress which the French people have made in the art of self-control, the only security of any republic.

Evidence of progress in self-government.

The first of these was the sudden and unexpected act of President MacMahon, in his fear lest the radical Republicans were going to obtain the control of the

President
MacMahon's
attempt to
control the
legislature.

government, by which he dismissed a cabinet having the confidence of the Houses, and appointed in its place a reactionary cabinet under the Duc de Broglie, and, after the dissolution of the legislature, attempted to fill



CASIMIR PÉRIER.

Fifth president. Born November 8, 1847.

up the new Houses as he desired by using freely all the methods of manipulating the elections which had proved so successful under the Second Empire. There was intense excitement in France, especially on the part of the extreme Republicans, but the manifestoes of the leaders were models of good advice, and the nation passed through the crisis to all intents and purposes as an

Anglo-Saxon nation would have done. The president succeeded in reducing the Republican majority but not in overcoming it, and in the end he submitted completely to the expressed will of the people.

The second was the attempt, ridiculous as it seems to us, of General Boulanger to pose as a military hero, combined with the extraordinary popular support which he secured for a moment. It seemed, for a few months,

He fails.

Boulanger's
fiasco, 1888-9.

as if he were entering upon the pathway, familiar to France, leading to a dictatorship and a *coup d'état*, and all the factions in the state which desired revolution, from the most opposite reasons, Red Republicans and Monarchists, rallied to his support. The sudden and complete collapse of the movement before the firm stand of the government is most hopeful evidence of the existence of a new France. Its collapse.

The period of the Third Republic has been one of very great economic advancement for France. There have been no wars to exhaust her resources, and the natural frugality of her people has led to a great accumulation of wealth. This is clearly seen in the vast amounts of private capital which are readily offered for investment in such enterprises as the Panama Canal, or in taking up the successive issues of the national debt, and there is need of this last, for the national debt has steadily grown notwithstanding the long interval of



Great
economic
prosperity.

M. FÉLIX FAURE.

Present president. Born January 30, 1841. Elected president January 17, 1895.

Colonial
efforts.

peace, and while it was only one sixth the debt of England at the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815, it is now twice as great. During this period France has been intensely interested in the effort to build up a colonial empire, and she has succeeded in Africa and in Further India in enlarging her possessions very greatly, but these efforts have been attended with great expense and it is yet by no means clear that any compensating advantage is to be found in them.

The present
condition very
promising for
the future.

Since 1790, France has had seventeen constitutions, of almost every imaginable variety. But the Third Republic has had the longest life of any government during that period. It is the only one under which there has been shown a steady and hopeful growth toward real self-government, and, notwithstanding the fact that there has seemed to be during its existence a more general feeling of insecurity than under most of the other governments of the century, it seems destined to be permanent. The Orleanist princes, who represent the monarchy since the death of the Comte de Chambord in 1883, seem to have practically abandoned all hope of reëstablishing a kingdom ; the attitude of the Roman Church, officially at least, is now most friendly ; and France has no further occasion to fear a revolution if it can continue its present practice of self-control and calmness, and cease to be thrown into a panic when anybody threatens violence.

SUMMARY FOR REVIEW.

WE have now followed the long course of French history from the time when Gaul makes its first appearance in record, the home of various half-barbarous tribes with no connected national life, from a time, that is, more than a hundred years before the Christian era, down to the end of the nineteenth century, when the same land is the home of a powerful and thoroughly united nation, ruling itself as a great republic. This history which we have followed, not in detail but in its most decisive changes, is the history of the transformation of this primitive people into the highly organized nation of to-day. This transformation has not always been brought about by influences at work within the nation itself, but often by forces from without, and during long periods of time the great mass of the nation has had no power to determine the direction of its growth, and yet it has been a regular growth, the stages of which we can trace from age to age.

The first of these stages is the Roman conquest, which brought the Gallic tribes into contact with a civilization much higher than their own, and in two or three centuries carried forward their political and intellectual development to a point which they would have needed double the time to reach by themselves. It gave a language, also, to the future nation, and institutions and ideas which were not lost.

This was followed by the German occupation, a new

A period of
2,000 years,

occupied by the
growth of the
nation.

The Roman
conquest is the
first stage.

SUMMARY FOR REVIEW.

WE have now followed the long course of French history from the time when Gaul makes its first appearance in record, the home of various half-barbarous tribes with no connected national life, from a time, that is, more than a hundred years before the Christian era, down to the end of the nineteenth century, when the same land is the home of a powerful and thoroughly united nation, ruling itself as a great republic. This history which we have followed, not in detail but in its most decisive changes, is the history of the transformation of this primitive people into the highly organized nation of to-day. This transformation has not always been brought about by influences at work within the nation itself, but often by forces from without, and during long periods of time the great mass of the nation has had no power to determine the direction of its growth, and yet it has been a regular growth, the stages of which we can trace from age to age.

A period of
2,000 years,

occupied by the
growth of the
nation.

The first of these stages is the Roman conquest, which brought the Gallic tribes into contact with a civilization much higher than their own, and in two or three centuries carried forward their political and intellectual development to a point which they would have needed double the time to reach by themselves. It gave a language, also, to the future nation, and institutions and ideas which were not lost.

The Roman
conquest is the
first stage.

This was followed by the German occupation, a new

The second is
the German
occupation.

element in the blood and institutions of the nation which had a profound influence upon the future. Already in the last days of the Roman Empire there had been a marked decline in civilization, which affected the province especially in the inability of the government to maintain public order and the security of life and property. Under the German governments which followed this, decline became more rapid and extreme, until a large part of the ancient civilization had temporarily disappeared, and, with occasional intervals of strong government, the same disorder and insecurity continued.

The third,
feudalism.

This condition of things carried France on rapidly into the third stage of its history, the stage of the feudal system. This was characterized by the breaking up of the state, no longer able to maintain a united government, into fragments, independent of one another and often hostile, determined in size and character, when they took their rise at least, by the ability of the local rulers to keep order and furnish security.

National unity
threatened.

This would seem to threaten a final dissolution of the nation, and many signs make known to us the fact that several nations, distinct in law, national feeling, and language, were actually forming within the bounds of the present state of France.

Modern
France created
by her king.

From such a result France was saved by the monarchy, and by the efforts of the Capetian family. A monarchical theory had come down from the Romans and from the best days of the early German state which could not be enforced in the feudal days but which was not forgotten. Generation after generation, with steady purpose, the Capetian kings weakened the feudal barons, absorbed their territories in the crown domain which formed France geographically, asserted and established one royal prerogative after another, and created political

institutions which organized the expanding state and vested all the functions of its government in the monarchy.

In this process of union, which was the creation of France, the greatest difficulty was that presented by the great English dominions in France, which threatened at one time to split the country into two rival states. But the English lands were held together by no common bond of union, and fell gradually under the French rule. This struggle retarded the formation of the French nation for a full hundred years, but in the end it aided greatly in the awakening of a national enthusiasm and patriotism which were of immense value for the future.

The English possessions were the chief obstacle.

As the formation of the nation, both geographically and politically, was due almost solely to the efforts of the kings, it resulted naturally in the supremacy of the king's will, or in identifying the state with the sovereign. The next stage, then, in the history of France is that of the absolute monarchy. The formation of the state had been attended, also, by the transformation of the social classes of the feudal age into those of the old *régime*. The feudal baron became the court noble, that is, he lost political rights and the power to rule his fief and received titles and pensions and the opportunity to make a display. The third estate of the towns became the *bourgeois* and developed a nobility of its own, that of the "robe." The serf and villain became the peasant and obtained relatively the least share in the advantages of the new age.

The success of the kings led to the absolute monarchy.

The age of the absolute monarchy was characterized by the rise of international politics, and by a long struggle for supremacy in Europe, first with Spain in Italy, and then with the House of Hapsburg, chiefly in the Rhine Valley. This conflict, while it did much to

The age of attempted European conquests begins.

satisfy the French desire for glory, and while it advanced the boundaries of the state to the east, prevented the nation from taking the share which we can now see it ought to have taken in the train of events which was opened by the discovery of the New World.

But England gains the colonial empire.

During this age, England, not so intimately involved in European rivalries, was slowly but steadily preparing for the next stage of history, the conflict for a great colonial empire in the New World and in India. In this later Hundred Years' War with England, France was handicapped by her continental position and by the long traditions of her foreign policy, and, notwithstanding the brilliant genius of French colonial commanders, the French Empire was destroyed.

The absolute monarchy leads finally to a revolution.

In the mean time a great force of public opinion had been growing up in France, demanding a reform of government. This had been created partly by the great scientific and intellectual advances which had recently been made and by the more general spread of intelligence, and partly by the keen sense of abuses and inequalities, which even the lowest classes felt. This public opinion found its special point of attack in the financial difficulties of the state, and in this way finally forced the government to call a representative assembly, the Estates General of 1789.

and this to the empire of Napoleon.

From this point France passed rapidly into the revolutionary stage of its history and for ten years vainly tried to rule itself, attempting to make up by theories and enthusiasm for its lack of experience and of practical knowledge. The failure of these attempts and the insecure outlook for the future made it easy for the man of genius and power, who could rule and who could give the state a definite policy, to create a new absolute monarchy. It was easy for him, also, to direct the

immense enthusiasm of revolutionary France into a new attempt to make the French power supreme in Europe. The attempt was a failure, and France was reduced to its original limits, but the effort had carried all Europe, as well as France, on into a new age—the age of the steadily growing influence of every people over its political life.

In France itself, this influence has been slow to arrive at a real control. The French people have been slow to learn the right way to exercise the great power to which they have so often made their governments yield when expressed through spasmodic and ill-directed revolutions. One government has succeeded another with great rapidity during the century, and these rapid changes have appeared to show but little growth in the nation's power to rule itself. But at last it has entered upon a most hopeful stage, in which it is showing the wisdom it has now gathered from experience and is really governing itself. We may venture to hope that our ancient friend and ally has finally found the way to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Since 1815
France has
tried various
forms of
government.

The present
republic gives
promise of
permanence.

INDEX.

- Aix-la-Chapelle, the peace of, of 1668, 216, 217; of 1745, 243.
- Albigenses, the, 86, 89, 90.
- Alcuin, 45.
- Alsace, 205.
- America, France in, 158, 186, 221, 226, 229, 243, 244, 246, 253, 310.
- Amiens, peace of, 309, 310.
- Anne of Austria, 202, 203, 204.
- Arabs, the, 39.
- Arian Christianity, 26, 29.
- Armagnacs, the, 126.
- Arras, treaty of, 133.
- Arteveld, James van, 110.
- Arteveld, Philip van, 125.
- Artois, Comte d', 276, 279, 321.
- Assembly, the Legislative, 285-287.
- Assembly, the National, 274, 276-285.
- Assiento*, the, 226.
- Assignats*, the, 283.
- Augsburg, the League of, 221.
- Avignon, 100-101, 110.
- Baillis*, the, 87, 93, 97.
- Bastille, the, 278, 281.
- "Bed of justice," 199.
- Black Death, the, 115.
- Blanche of Castile, 89.
- Bonaparte, Napoleon. See Napoleon I.
- Boniface VIII., pope, 97-101.
- Boniface, St., 41.
- Boulanger, General, 338.
- Bourbon, the, family, 168, 171.
- Bourgeois*, the, class, 68, 69, 100, 156, 157.
- Bourges, Pragmatic Sanction of, 150.
- Brétigny, treaty of, 118.
- Broglié, Duc de, 338.
- Burgundians, the, 23, 26, 27, 32.
- Burgundy, duchy of, 124, 137, 141, 154.
- Cabochians, the, 127.
- Calais, 112, 133, 163, 172, 207.
- Calvin, John, 165.
- Camisards, the, 224.
- Campo-Formio, the treaty of, 301.
- Capetians, the, 49, 53, 54-72.
- Carnot, Lazare, 298, 301, 334.
- Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte, 324, 334.
- Carnot, Sadi, 334.
- Carolingians, the, 36-53, 57.
- Castile, 120.
- Catherine de Medici, 169.
- Celtic race, 11, 14, 17.
- Châlons, battle of, 24.
- Charlemagne, 43-46.
- Charles I. of England, 210.
- Charles II. of England, 217.
- Charles V., 119-123.
- Charles VI., 123-129.
- Charles VII., 129-135, 137, 150.
- Charles VIII., 143-146.
- Charles IX., 169-174.
- Charles X., 321.
- Charles V., the emperor, 149, 151-155, 160, 162.
- Charles II. of Spain, 216, 221.
- Charles the Bold, of Burgundy, 138-141, 149.
- Charles Martel, 39, 42.
- Choiseul, the duke of, 247-249, 250.
- Christianity among the Germans, 26, 29; in Gaul, 19.
- Church, the Frankish, 40, 41; the French, 58, 72, 98, 100, 149, 151, 156, 228, 252, 283, 310.
- Class distinctions, Frankish, 31; Roman, 20.
- Clovis, 25-28, 32.
- Colbert, 212-216, 220.
- Coligny, the admiral, 164, 171, 173.
- Colonies, French, 186, 215, 243-247, 249, 254, 294, 310, 328, 340.
- Comitatus*, the, 30.
- Commune*, the, 69, 78.
- Commune, the Paris, 329.

- Concordat, the, of Francis I., 149-151.
 Condé, the great, 204, 205, 207, 219.
 Consulate, the, 306.
 Convention, the National, 287-297.
 Crécy, battle of, 112, 113.
 Crimean War, 328.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 207.
 Crusades, the, 63, 79, 83, 92, 101.
 Dagobert I., 33, 48.
 Debt, French national, 283, 339.
 Departments, the, created, 281.
 Devolution, the right of, 216.
 Directory, the, 295.
 Du Barry, Madame, 249, 250.
 Dunkirk, 207.
 "Dupes, the Day of," 198.
 Dupleix, 243, 244, 246.
 Edward I. of England, 102, 105.
 Edward III. of England, 105-121, 123.
 Edward IV. of England, 140.
 Edward the Black Prince, 120, 123.
 Egypt, France in, 229, 303, 306.
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, 76, 79, 80, 118.
 Elizabeth of England, 163, 172.
Émigrés, the, 285, 320.
Enquêteurs, the, 93, 200.
 Estates General, the, 99, 100, 103, 116-118, 121, 135, 142, 143, 181, 183, 190; of 1789, 256, 258, 273-277.
 Eugene, Prince, 223, 224.
 Faure, Félix, 339.
 Ferdinand of Spain, 144, 146-149, 151.
 Ferdinand VII. of Spain, 320.
 Ferry, Jules, 336.
 Feudal system, the, 55-56, 63-72, 89, 90, 121, 155, 156, 181; origin of, 22, 30, 50-52.
 Flanders, 75, 102, 108-111, 124.
 Fleury, 240.
 Fouquet, 212.
 Franche-Comté, 141, 144, 151, 217, 219.
 Francis I., 148-159.
 Francis II., 164, 167-169.
 Franco-Prussian War, 329.
 Franks, the, 23, 24, 25-46.
 Frederick II., the Great, of Prussia, 223, 241, 243, 246.
 Fronde, the, 203-205.
 Gallican Church, liberties of the, 228.
 German conquest of Gaul, 11, 16, 23-31, 25-46.
 Gibraltar, 223, 226.
 Girondists, the, 285-292.
 Grevy, 333, 337.
 Guards, National, 278, 297, 321.
 Guise, family of, 162, 163, 167-177, 181.
 Guizot, 320, 323.
 Hapsburg, the House of, 149, 187, 194, 206, 208, 235, 241, 314.
 Henry I., 61.
 Henry II., 160-164, 168.
 Henry III., 174-177.
 Henry IV., 174, 177-188, 195, 210, 257.
 Henry I. of England, 75, 76.
 Henry II. of England, 80-83.
 Henry III. of England, 90, 91.
 Henry V. of England, 128, 129.
 Henry VI. of England, 129.
 Henry VIII. of England, 148, 153, 155.
 Holland, republic of, 217-219, 224-227.
 Hugh Capet, 55-57, 60, 106.
 Huguenots, the, 165-179, 189, 190, 195-197, 224, 227-228.
 Huns, the, 24.
 India, France in, 243, 244, 246, 254.
 Intendants, the, 200, 204.
 Jacobins, the, 285, 287.
 Jacquerie, the, 115.
 James II. of England, 221, 223.
 Joan of Arc, 130-132.
 John II., 113-119, 123.
 John of England, 83-86.
 John, duke of Burgundy, 126-128.
 Judicial system, Frankish, 30; growth of, 93, 94.
 Julius Cæsar, 15-17.
 Kingship, the Frankish, 29.
 Knights Templars, destruction of, 101.
 La Fayette, 271, 279, 287.
 La Fontaine, 230.
 Law, French, growth of, 94-95, 142, 297, 308.
 Law, John, 237-239.
 League, the Catholic, 175-178, 181.
 League of the Public Weal, 139.
 Legislative system, Frankish, 30.
 Leipzig, battle of, 314.
 Leo X., pope, 149, 153.
 Lombards, the, 41-43.
 Lorraine, 48, 140, 207, 249.
 Louis VI., 73-78, 108, 197.
 Louis VII., 78-81.

- Louis VIII., 89.
 Louis IX., Saint, 89-96, 98, 177, 197.
 Louis XI., 136-143.
 Louis XII., 147-148.
 Louis XIII., 188-202.
 Louis XIV., Chap. XIII., 235.
 Louis XV., 234-250.
 Louis XVI., 250-257, 274-279.
 Louis XVIII., 315, 319-320.
 Louis Philippe, 321-323.
 Louis the Pious, 47, 91.
 Louisiana, 310-311.
 MacMahon, 331, 334, 337-338.
 Maintenon, Madame de, 227.
 Marcel, Etienne, 117, 118.
 Maria Louisa, 314.
 Maria Theresa, of Austria, 241, 243.
 Marie Antoinette, 255, 278, 291.
 Marlborough, 223, 225.
 Mary de Medici, 188, 189.
 Mary of Burgundy, 141.
 Mary Stuart, 167, 169.
 Maximilian I., the emperor, 141, 146, 148, 149, 151.
 Mayors of the palace, the, 37.
 Mazarin, 202-209, 211, 212.
 Merovingians, the, 32-38, 48.
 Milan, 147, 151.
 Mirabeau, 271, 275, 277, 285, 289.
Missi dominici, the, 45, 46, 87.
 Molière, 232.
 Monroe Doctrine, 320.
 Montesquieu, 270, 271.
 Nantes, edict of, 179; revocation of, 227, 228.
 Naples, kingdom of, 146, 154.
 Napoleon I., 292, 297-307, Chap. XVII.
 Napoleon III., 325-329.
 Necker, 253-256, 277, 279, 282.
 Nimwegen, peace of, 216, 219.
 Nobility, the, of the old *régime*, 155, 156, 197.
 Normandy, 49, 61, 62, 75, 85, 91, 111.
 Northmen, the, 49.
 Papacy, the, 42, 98, 100.
 Parlement, French, 94, 199, 204, 248, 252, 256.
 Périer, Casimir, 338.
 Philip I., 61, 62.
 Philip II., Augustus, 81-88, 95, 108, 197.
 Philip III., 95.
 Philip IV., the Fair, 96-103, 105.
 Philip V., 104.
 Philip VI., 105-113.
 Philip II. of Spain, 163, 164, 175, 178.
 Philip V. of Spain, 224, 225, 235, 236.
 Philip, duke of Burgundy, 124-126.
 Philip Égalité of Orleans, 291, 321.
 Philip of Orleans, the regent, 235-239.
 Pippin the Short, 40-43.
 Poitiers, battle of, 113.
Politiques, the, 175-177.
Prévôts, the, 87, 97.
 Provence, 16, 32, 142.
 Provinces, the, abolished, 281.
 Pyrenees, the peace of the, 207.
 Racine, 231.
 Ravaillac, 188.
 Reformation, the, 158, 164-167.
 Renaissance, the, 157-158.
 Republic, the First French, 287; the Second, 323; the Third, 329.
 Reunion, the chambers of, 220.
 Revolution, American, 253, 254, 259, 261, 271.
 Revolution, French, 259, Chap. XVI.; causes of, Chap. XV.
 Rhine, the, frontier, 48, 160-162, 206, 309.
 Rhine, the League of the, 207.
 Richard I. of England, 83, 84.
 Richelieu, 192-205, 210, 211.
 Robert I., 60.
 Robespierre, 291.
 Roman conquest of Gaul, 11, 14-22.
 Roman Empire, revived by Charlemagne, 44.
 Roman institutions, influence of, 17-18, 20-22, 29.
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 269, 270.
 Ryswick, peace of, 216, 221.
 St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 174.
 Salian Franks, 25.
 Salic Law, the, 104, 177, 208.
 San Domingo, the, expedition, 310.
 Savoy, 220, 224, 226, 288, 328.
 Saxons, the, 24, 39, 41, 43.
 Scotland, 102, 105.
 Serfage, 21, 65-67, 157.
 Siéyès, 276, 306.
 Spanish succession, the, 208, 216, 221-223.

- Spanish Succession, War of the, 208,
 216, 223-227, 233.
 Strasburg, 17, 206, 220, 221.
 Suger, the abbot, 79.
 Sully, duke of, 185-187, 211, 216.
 Swiss, the, 142, 149, 151.
 Taxation, 97, 117, 121, 135, 185, 211,
 213, 261, 267.
 Tennis Court, Oath of the, 274.
 Terror, the Reign of, 290-292.
 Thiers, 329-331.
 Thirty Years' War, the, 188, 193-195,
 200-201, 205.
 Tilsit, peace of, 311.
 Tours, battle of, 40.
 Turenne, 204, 205, 207, 219.
 Turgot, 250-253, 255.
 Union, the Protestant, 175, 181.
 University of Paris, the, 88.
 Utrecht, peace of, 216, 225-227, 235.
 Valmy, battle of, 287.
 Vassy, the massacre of, 170.
 Vauban, 220, 225.
 Vendée, La, 290, 308.
 Verdun, the treaty of, 47, 48, 80.
 Villain, the, 64, 67, 157.
 Visigoths, the, 23-24, 26, 27.
 Voltaire, 268, 269, 270.
 Wagram, battle of, 313.
 Waterloo, battle of, 316.
 Wellington, the duke of, 313.
 Westphalia, treaty of, 205, 207.
 William I. of England, 61, 62.
 William of Orange, 219, 221.

Abstract

3 1 1 0 2 2 2

DATE DUE

JUL 23 2000

GAYLORD

LIBRARY. SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, STANFORD



1K
944.2
A2



Longitude East 6 from Greenwich.

